

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

May 10, 2006

5:30 PM

Mayor Guinta called the meeting to order.

Mayor Guinta called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Forest.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy (late), Gatsas (late), Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Smith, Thibault, Forest

Absent: Alderman Garrity

Mayor Guinta stated in case anybody has not been following we were in the process of reviewing our yellow sheets. Alderman Gatsas will be a few minutes late so we will start with Fire.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Fire**.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Joe can you tell us first of all can you live with the yellow sheet response.

Joseph Kane, Fire Chief, responded yes. As I noted in there specifically with the regular salaries and money coming out of the salary adjustment account.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the only numbers that I see that are a little bit different are the state retirement from where the Mayor is. There is about a \$400,000 difference from the Mayor's request and where you are. It looks like those are the only two lines. I see about a \$300,000 or \$214,000/\$215,000 difference in retirement and about a \$100,000 in the FICA payment. I don't know if either one of those are numbers that you put in there.

Chief Kane replied no. I might also note that the health is a different number than what was originally put in there and none of those numbers are our numbers.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked can somebody tell me who puts the state retirement number in. Ginny is that yours? The number that is here is about \$223,000 more. Can you explain to me what that difference is?

Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, answered actually the department's projections for retirement in Group 2 were \$2,007,754.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded right but I am looking at the difference in the Mayor's. With the same salary I am looking to see why those two numbers would be different.

Ms. Lamberton replied I didn't have anything to do with the Mayor's budget so I don't know how those numbers got in the Mayor's budget.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked and the FICA.

Ms. Lamberton answered that happens automatically based on the gross wages.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I understand that but why is there a difference in the FICA versus one side or the other.

Ms. Lamberton stated we had put in what it says in the first column, \$396,798 but that was based on the top number of \$15,368,096.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I am not looking at the request column. I am looking at the Mayor's column.

Ms. Lamberton responded again I had nothing to do with the numbers that are in the Mayor's budget.

Alderman Shea stated I think the difference between the two figures would be the Mayor's salary number is much lower than the projected salary so, therefore, the FICA would be different and the retirement would be different as far as I can see.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied all I am saying is the comparison I was looking at was the yellow sheet response and the Mayor's response the wages are the same. I am asking why those numbers would be different based on two criteria that should be the same.

Alderman DeVries stated we do have two of the Mayor's staff here. Maybe they can answer where the numbers came from. Wait, here is the Mayor. He can answer for himself.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated your Honor there was a question...I am looking at the two numbers...there is about a \$400,000 difference between your number and the yellow sheet number they say they can live with. What I am seeing is the two places where there seems to be a difference is in the state retirement number. There is about a \$220,000 in the state retirement number and about a \$100,000 difference in the FICA number.

Mayor Guinta responded I would have to go back and take a look at a little more in depth why there is a difference between the two, particularly when there has not been a reduction in the salary. Is this an updated number from Human Resources based on...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected Human Resources says that the \$2,007,754 is relative to the \$14.650 million that they have.

Mayor Guinta stated well the only reason I would suggest that that is no correct is the \$2 million number is cited in the FY07 request. It was reduced based on my salary line but it goes back up on the yellow sheet response even though the salary is not increased. Quite frankly to give you a more in depth answer I would have to go back and go through the budget a little bit. When does the Committee meet next? Monday? I can get that to you.

Clerk Bernier stated a date and time has not been set for the Finance Committee to meet. We have CIP scheduled for Monday night.

Mayor Guinta stated let me get you a written response before the next meeting.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to walk through this Chief. You answered Alderman Gatsas' question regarding can you live with the yellow sheet number and you said you could but that is with if we flip over to the back side of your yellow sheet that is with two conditions that I want to make sure we are clear on. One is that the approximately \$700,000 is available in salary adjustment or a number somewhat less than that? I will go to overtime and I don't think you were necessarily going to answer that but let's stay with the salary line item.

Chief Kane replied at this point in time that is what we calculated.

Alderman O'Neil asked could you repeat that please.

Chief Kane answered at this point in time that is the number that we calculated. It is \$717,000.

Alderman O'Neil asked you are at full complement today.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked you just had a graduating class of how many on Friday.

Chief Kane answered seven.

Alderman O'Neil stated congratulations to them. Hopefully that will help out going into the summer season for vacation time regarding regular salaries and overtime?

Chief Kane responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked so as of tonight you are going to do everything you can to live within the \$22.508 million but you are telling us that the chances are pretty good you are going to have to come back for a good portion of the salary adjustment.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked regarding overtime the bullet says the overtime line is short but we will attempt to live within the appropriation by placing ladder trucks out of service during the fiscal year. Does that mean the entire fiscal year?

Chief Kane answered no it would not be the entire fiscal year. Our biggest impact is during the summer months where we need the staffing due to vacations. July, August, September and then we would reevaluate it at that time.

Alderman O'Neil asked so you should be okay starting off the fiscal year with a full complement.

Chief Kane answered right but you have to understand that I am going to have to assess the impact right away at the beginning of the fiscal year in regards to the overtime because I can't wait until the of the fiscal year to make any adjustments because that is when the impact comes, during the summer time.

Alderman O'Neil replied I understand that you have to start July 1. Mayor this is probably the department that seems to be off the most. It is roughly \$1 million between salary and overtime. I know you want to try to address things using the salary adjustment. I am just concerned that it is a pretty substantial number that we are off with the Fire Department. I know you said you are committed to managing it but I think we need to avoid putting any companies out of service, etc.

Mayor Guinta responded again the salary adjustment line, the priorities I have obviously set would be public safety and that would be Police and Fire. So to the extent that I am looking to keep the complement that we have with the Fire Department and work through managing the salary adjustment on the entire City is what I am committed to. That means that I am going to have to assertively manage that salary adjustment. The same thing with Police. I am expecting Police to fill the vacancies and then add the six additional officers. Again, I will have to manage the adjustment line on a citywide basis through vacancies and attrition. That is where I am expecting to identify those savings. I will reiterate what I said last night. If the Board feels a greater comfort level with trying to identify funds within the existing budget to increase the salary line, I would certainly work with the Board to try to find those dollars.

Alderman O'Neil asked based on what you believe in your office working with the Fire Department would you expect that we should not see companies out of service during the year.

Mayor Guinta replied are you asking me or the Chief.

Alderman O'Neil responded I am asking you, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated I have talked to the Chief about that issue. I think one of the ways in which he has identified he could manage is to do what has been done in the past. Look at trucks out of service for a short term basis. I will do what I can to make sure that doesn't happen but again it is going to be pretty critical to have that salary adjustment line to the extent that if we reduce that salary adjustment line that is going to be more challenging. If it stays where it is it is challenging but I think we can do it. If you want to find more money to put in there that doesn't impact the tax rate that would give me greater flexibility.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you and you may have said this at one of the previous meetings but do you expect that salary adjustment can or cannot be used for overtime.

Mayor Guinta answered it can be. I am hoping...that is a decision that we are going to have to make as the year progresses. That will eat into that line pretty quickly so I am hoping that the City can manage the overtime. Now if we have a higher attrition rate this year it is going to create additional flexibility because at that point when you are filling a vacancy it takes a little time to fill a vacancy number one and secondly you are probably filling it at a lower salary level than the person who is leaving and we would also be looking at whether that position is necessary as we move forward in trying to reorganize how we deliver services in the other departments. Those are sort of the tools that I am looking at. I have tried

to be...you know 4% is the right number in terms of the salary adjustment. I didn't feel comfortable going beyond 4% quite frankly because then you are expecting that the attrition rate is going to be higher than the historical averages but if we do have a historically high year for attrition that will give us more flexibility and again it depends on where the attrition comes from.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a few more questions but I will yield to let others speak.

Alderman Thibault stated one thing I would like to know is whenever you do take a truck out chances are it would be a truck on the West Side right. The truck on Main Street?

Chief Kane responded not necessarily.

Alderman Thibault stated almost every time that you have had to take a truck out that is the truck that has been out. That is why I am asking.

Chief Kane replied it is one of them yes.

Alderman Thibault stated the reason I am asking is the neighborhoods that we live in on the West Side where we have all of these big apartment buildings a ladder truck is very important and if there is a major fire out there and somebody gets killed somebody is going to cry. I am just wondering and I am sure that the other West Side Aldermen are also thinking the way I am. I would like to see as little as possible of that happening. I want to be on record. If ever something happens they will know that I mentioned it and it shouldn't have happened.

Alderman Roy stated Chief I am going to make some comments and I am going to make them freely. You know that I have a great deal of respect for your leadership of the Fire Department but I find this unacceptable. I find it outrageous. The first note on the back of your page says that you are willing to live with the yellow sheet number based on the salary adjustment account. That I can respect. It is the Mayor's management decision and I respect you and your leadership to go ahead and try to live with that. The second part that I find absolutely appalling is the discussion of ladder trucks being out of service. It is my belief and I know it is the belief of a few other Aldermen here that we are currently understaffed and we should have DC's and three or four people on a ladder truck and the City is just waiting for one of our line firefighters or one of our officers on those trucks to get injured or possibly killed. It has happened in the past. I don't want to be on this Board when it happens again. I know as a Chief you have had these discussions with your staff. You don't want to be in charge when that happens. It is a tragic moment for the entire City. For the tax

savings of \$1 million I find it absolutely appalling and I find it appalling that if this Board let's this go through that I will find a shared blame. The ladder truck on Webster Street was out for quite a bit of time. Main Street was also out. If you look at the homes that are affected and look at the response times it is unacceptable. I take it as an affront to the taxpayers of this City. The taxpayers know that I fight for them and I am fine with that but I also want to fight for the person that doesn't realize that when a ladder truck goes out or an engine is out or understaffed that you are putting or the department through the budgetary process is putting lives in danger whether they are taxpayers or City employees. I do find it appalling that we are in this yellow sheet process and one of the statements is that we may be putting apparatus out of service for part of the year. That is my viewpoint. I will also follow that up with I will work with you in any possible way to bring your expenditures down to a point where you don't have to put anything out of service. I will give you whatever time you need as I am sure a lot of the Aldermen here will but I would ask my colleagues that if we look at two budgets and talk about public safety that we do not put the taxpayers in jeopardy when it comes to response times and we not put our City employees in jeopardy when it comes to their safety at a fire and I am also going to make the same statement about criminal scenes or investigations of the Police Department.

Alderman Smith stated Chief I know you have a difficult situation. I am just looking at regular salaries and overtime and it comes out to \$1.248 million plus. As you know we renovated the South Main Street fire station for \$1.6 million and it was a tough battle to get the resources and now I know for a fact that that ladder truck will be pulled out. There is no question in my mind. It always has been. It went without a ladder truck this past year for eight months. I would think personally \$1.248 million out of the budget would be too much for me to expect from a Fire Department and I don't know how much money we are going to have in the salary adjustment account but I will tell everybody it seems like it is Pandora's box and we are not going to have enough money to cover this situation. I hope you address and I hope that you pay attention. We have a new firehouse and we have excellent firemen and we hope that ladder truck stays there through the course of the year.

Alderman DeVries stated I am hoping that I can ask my first question of Mayor Guinta if you would indulge me. Mayor Guinta I understand that you said the two ladder trucks is somewhat of an acceptable situation to try to save in the overtime and increase the floating personnel available to cover that overtime during high vacation utilization. Can you tell me at what level you think the Fire Department, specifically the Fire Department, we will be hampering public safety? At what level of manning? What additional equipment going out of service would you be looking to step in and make sure that you are managing and making the salary adjustment account available to them?

Mayor Guinta responded I am not sure I understand your question.

Alderman DeVries replied well built into this budget is an automatic assumption that two ladder trucks will be taken out of service. They cannot meet what they have agreed to on this yellow sheet without first taking two trucks out of service and making that manpower floating to cover any shift that comes up for overtime. It puts them on a floating basis so what level above that, what additional pieces of equipment and what additional number of men being put into a floating situation and being taken off of their normal assignment do you consider...you have stated that you don't want to hamper public safety or jeopardize public safety in the City so if you would just tell me if it is not two ladder trucks what is the level that you have identified when you made up this budget that you are going to keep them at? Is one more pump acceptable? Two? What is the number since you will be managing...

Mayor Guinta interjected are you saying that you want to put more trucks out of service.

Alderman DeVries replied I am asking you what you are advocating.

Mayor Guinta responded I am not advocating for a reduction in trucks. I met with the Chief to talk about ways to make this budget work and provide a service. We talked about what has been done in the history of the City. This is a practice that from time to time has been implemented even while, I think, I was an Alderman. It is something that he and I talked about and I have a very good feeling from the Chief that this is going to be providing service at the best possible level we can given the dollars and the resources we have.

Alderman DeVries asked do you realize that to manage their salary line through attrition, which would be retirements, meaning that somebody is planning on not making an immediate hire to replace somebody after they retire when you are talking mandatory staffing in order to maintain the number of personnel needed on the trucks or the pumps would mean that another piece of equipment will have to go out for somebody else to cover that position.

Mayor Guinta answered I understand what you said but I don't agree with what you said. When you are managing the vacancy rate in the entire City you are not doing it department...I am not going to manage the 4% in the Fire Department and say well we have to have a vacancy within the Fire Department for six months in order to save six months worth of salary. That could come from the entire \$16 million payroll in the City. Why I took it out of the general salary line is quite

frankly because you cannot predict where the attrition is going to occur from one year to the next in the City.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked do you have questions for the department head Alderman.

Alderman DeVries answered I will get there if I might. I am just trying to understand where he is...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected I understand where you are going but I don't think is a question and answer period for the Mayor. The department is here to address questions that we have on a budget. My suggestion is if you would like to continue that you continue with the department.

Alderman DeVries responded Mr. Chairman I understand that you might not think it is the right time but since the Mayor was here I thought I would figure out what he is predicating his budget on since the department is saying they can live with that so that when my constituents ask me if additional personnel or additional apparatus has to be put out of service I can tell them maybe some of the reasoning behind it. Since the Mayor just indicated that he will be managing, maybe by and I heard some comments last night and I will ask Chief Kane, I don't know if you were listening in last night, probably not but I did hear some statements made last night to other departments that he is not planning on laying off and creating vacancies in other departments and he did seem to be indicating to other department heads that they shouldn't be making the assumption that they are losing other staff so somehow for me I am trying to figure out how the \$1 million that is going to be put into this kitty for salary adjustment throughout the City is going to work. I still have a concern. I had this concern when I spoke with you a few weeks ago in front of this Committee that the cuts were too large. I didn't see how you could manage that within your department. I asked you what we had used for management tools before and above and beyond putting pieces out of service and making extra people available to cover overtime you really haven't found tools to create savings within your department so in your mind when you have an individual retire you have an expectation that you are going to be able to replace that individual right away. In fact you keep a pool of ready employees, a reserve ready to hire at any given time who have met the tests and requirements to be hired.

Chief Kane responded yes and depending on what time of year it is, you know during the winter we may wait a little longer but during the summer we need full staff.

Alderman DeVries asked if in the summer time or on one of the high vacation times you are not able to make an immediate hire, what are you going to be doing within your budget in order to meet this very tight budget that you are agreeing to tonight. How are you going to respond to that? How are you going to manage?

Mayor Guinta answered like he always has. I don't know why we have to be adversarial here. I will jump in...

Alderman DeVries interjected I am not trying to be adversarial.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated look Alderman, I understand...

Alderman DeVries interjected first let's let him answer the question and then we can jump in.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no I guess we can go to another Alderman right after he answers your question.

Chief Kane asked do you want to know what happens in the middle of summer time if someone leaves say August 1 and I am not able to hire someone for that position. Well what happens is I have to pay somebody overtime to sit in that seat.

Alderman DeVries responded that wasn't the question. You are managing...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected and called upon Alderman Osborne.

Alderman DeVries stated we did say that we would let him answer the one question.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded I will come back to you Alderman.

Alderman Osborne stated Chief you said you could live with the yellow sheet with the salary adjustment. I think the main worry here is the ladder trucks. Basically how many would be on full-time. How many ladder trucks are you going to have in the summer time?

Chief Kane responded probably four.

Alderman Osborne asked and where are they housed.

Chief Kane answered those decisions haven't really been made yet.

Alderman Osborne asked well would you have anything on the West Side at all.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the response time.

Chief Kane stated we would never leave the West Side uncovered.

Alderman Osborne stated well I don't know what the problem is with the ladder trucks. I am confused. If the response time is there and you have something on the West Side and East Side and you are going to let two trucks down in the summer only...is that what you are saying?

Chief Kane replied I believe that is what we might do. Those types of issues haven't really been worked out yet. We don't have a budget but at that point in time I would sit down with the Mayor and have a discussion on how we should proceed.

Alderman Osborne stated I think it is something we should know.

Alderman Lopez stated Chief I don't know what is going on here but for a department head to come here and look at this and say you are short \$700,000 in the salary account and Alderman Gatsas said about \$400,000 in the restricted accounts and for you not to demand that the salary account at least be put back into your budget...there is no way. From Day 1 you are going to have to manage and you are going to have to micromanage. You are going to have to do everything because you know what is going to happen to the salary adjustment account? We haven't set it up yet and there is no ordinance on it and if you think you are going to come in for overtime this is one Alderman who isn't going to give you any money for overtime from the salary adjustment account because that is not what the salary adjustment account is for. Now you want \$700,000. Those are the restricted items by law that we have to pay. I can't understand how you as Chief of the Fire Department or any department head can't say that you need this money without saying that you are going to manage it. Manage it by laying off, well not laying off but putting trucks out of service. That is what we are going to go to because whatever way this salary adjustment account...whether the Mayor is going to be the one saying what comes out of there or whether the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are going to be the ones saying what comes out of there...you know Kevin Clougherty and Randy Sherman taught me a long time ago if you need the money you give it to the department head. You make them responsible. Now the responsibility is shifting the other way. I am shocked that you can't stand up and demand that this money be put into the account for your people.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if that is a question fine but I don't think we need to be, as Alderman...they are here to address our questions. We don't need to reprimand them. I think that they are employees of the City. I think that we should give them the same courtesy that we expect back.

Alderman Lopez replied the same courtesy that you sometimes give to people up here, Alderman, I am giving.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked really.

Alderman Lopez stated now I have my question. On the overtime salary line you indicated you were about \$333,000 short. The actual expenditures in the FY05 and what you did in FY06 how did you come in with \$1.1 million?

Chief Kane responded the difference between FY05 and FY06 is that there were stations that were out of service. Specifically Station #2 was out of service and I used that personnel to reduce the overtime budget as floating.

Alderman Lopez asked so if this \$700,000 for the salary adjustment account...if you can't get the money out of there for some reason what would you do. If the Mayor said don't bring that here, I am the Mayor don't bring that here or I am the Mayor you are not bringing it here...you are a department head so tell me what you would do.

Chief Kane answered well obviously...

Mayor Guinta interjected I am sorry. I have to answer that before the Chief does because this doesn't...the questions that you are asking Alderman I appreciate the questions but the Chief and I have had multiple meetings and conversations about how to manage the department and the salary adjustment. I talked to many of the department heads about it. I am going to be giving Police and Fire their needs to meet the complement. I have said it publicly several times and I will say it again. Public safety is critical in this City. In order to manage a budget we have to start to learn how to actually demand the Mayor do his job and ask for a greater level of accountability and cooperation from the department heads. I can tell you that Joe Kane has met with me several times and in the last meeting there was a very, I think, agreeable approach as to how to manage this. I don't think it is fair for you to ask him what happens if the Mayor doesn't give you money because I already said I would. I expect him to keep the complement he has. I expect the Police Department to have the seven vacancies filled and the six additional officers that we are trying to appropriate. This is about taking the best practices of business, common practices in the business world, which is nothing more than managing your margin and trying to make that money work a little bit longer. So if it means

that we have a retirement or a vacancy or somebody leaves to serve the employment of the City in one area you can utilize those dollars towards public safety. I have made no secret that public safety is of an utmost priority for me. That is where the resources are going to go first. Now the other departments and the other department heads are going to have to do an extremely good job of managing their department because there will be some times that I am going to wait on filling a vacancy and that is no different than what has happened in the last several years. The difference here is that I am going to be much more assertive in trying to manage that because I do think we need to have a much more business like approach. We have to be more efficient. We have to demand greater accountability and we need tax relief in the City. I can certainly appreciate your questions to the Chief. I think they are somewhat unfair and I am not going to let the Chief try to take a bullet for me here. I will answer those questions. We had conversations about how we feel this is going to be managed. That conversation is going to happen through the next 12 months of this fiscal year. This is not the kind of Mayor who is going to say here is the budget and I go on vacation. I am going to do my job each and every day. If people want to ask the department heads questions, that is fine but let's provide a little respect to them because I have met with them. They are, thankfully, working with me and trying to figure out how to manage the dollars that I am recommending. If this Board so chooses that they don't believe in that management style or they don't believe in tax relief than this Board can speak but I don't want a Board member to put it on a department head as if its their fault. This is my budget. I crafted it. I will answer the questions. Let's pay the department heads a little bit of respect and let's appreciate the fact that I have met and I will continue to meet with each department head to determine how we achieve the resources and the dollars for the potential shortfalls that the Aldermen see as concerns. Again I reiterate if you feel that there is not enough money in the salary adjustment and it is a legitimate concern then let's find money in the budget to increase that line item and if that provides a greater level of comfort to this Board I am willing to work with you on it but I don't want department heads reprimanded for things like why aren't you demanding that the Mayor fill your salary line. We have had those conversations. We have had them many times. I trust his approach and I think he is trusting my approach.

Alderman Lopez stated I thank you for that explanation your Honor and let me just respond by saying that I believe it is also the Aldermen's responsibility. This is governed by 14 people other than yourself. I will accept your answer but I would like to ask you another question since you wanted to jump in here.

Mayor Guinta responded I jumped in because I felt like we were going after the Fire Chief.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated we are trying to be on a time schedule.

Alderman Lopez stated the question I have is the obligation of roughly \$400,000 that is obligated to put in the restricted account what would you recommend we do. That is an obligation.

Mayor Guinta asked the aggregate sum of the restricted line items.

Alderman Lopez answered roughly \$358,000 or \$378,000 but I will go along with Alderman Gatsas with the \$400,000.

Mayor Guinta asked are you referencing the restricted line items.

Alderman Lopez answered yes the health, dental, life.

Mayor Guinta stated again that becomes part of the number that I manage through the salary adjustment. That is what I was trying to clarify earlier but that becomes part of the management for salary adjustment.

Alderman Lopez stated that is already \$1.1 million. Anyway we can move on.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated seeing that the question was brought up Chief because I brought the question up the first time you were in, the overtime in FY05 was \$405,000 based on \$14 million of original payroll. You had a station down. You didn't use the overtime. In FY06 you had a station down. Well how did you get to \$773,000 from \$409,000? I guess that is my question. You had the same 20 people down and you increased overtime by some \$370,000.

Chief Kane responded during that period of time there were two ladders down and also there was a station down for another period of time. That is why it was down that low.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied if I understand what you are telling me, if you have a station down that is what reduces overtime because that is what you are telling me happened in FY05. Your overtime was at \$400,000 because you had a station down.

Chief Kane responded correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated then I would say to you that your overtime in FY06 should be \$400,000 because you had a station down and it is at \$770,000.

Chief Kane replied the reason in 2004 is that the station...there were actually two events that occurred. During the summertime of 2004 for 17 weeks two ladder trucks were out of service. In the spring of that year that is when the station went down so there were two events that stacked on top of each other.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are you rustproofing a ladder truck.

Chief Kane answered no. We don't really rustproof the ladder trucks. Are we spending money on rustproofing...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected well I hope you are rustproofing something because this Board allocated some \$80,000 for rustproofing so what are you rustproofing.

Chief Kane answered it is not rustproofing it is rust repair. It is repairing rust that we have.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how long does it take to repair rust on a truck.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered right now we have four trucks that we are looking at that need vehicle rust repair. The overall cost of that is going to run somewhere in the area of the \$100,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how long does it take to do a truck.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered probably a month.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so for four months you are not going to have four trucks. No, you are not going to have a truck a month.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered that is not correct. We have spare apparatus so if an engine company goes out of service we replace it with a spare engine company. We have no spare ladder trucks so when we lose a ladder truck we are physically down one ladder truck and can't make that up. That rust repair is rust repair for damage that has already been incurred. It has nothing to do with rustproofing.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Chief I go back to the same question. From your FY05 number of \$14 million based on what you requested, which was \$15.3 million, that is \$1.3 million. The difference between overtime in 2004 and 2005 to what your request was was \$700,000. That is better than 50% of the wages that you asked for in regular salary. The difference from 2005. I thought we resolved that problem by saying hire more people at the regular rate so we don't pay time

and a half. It would be cheaper to have 10 firemen sitting around in the wintertime to offset your overtime.

Mayor Guinta stated now we are at full complement.

Alderman Roy asked would you like a second to that motion.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas answered I don't have a problem if he is going to reduce his overtime back to \$400,000. I don't have a problem doing that.

Alderman Shea asked when did Engine #8 open. What year was that?

Chief Kane answered February 2004.

Alderman Shea asked so that would have been in the FY05 budget.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated so that would probably also be an indication that you didn't need as much overtime in FY05 as you did in FY06 right or am I mistaken.

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated in February 2004 Engine #8 opened so the budget in FY05 would have been reflective of less overtime and then in FY06 when it was open I would assume from what he is saying that might indicate somewhat why there might or might not have been more expenses and so forth. Is that...should it be more or less as far as overtime?

Chief Kane responded it would be more.

Alderman Shea stated well maybe that is one of the components.

Chief Kane stated that is one of the components. There are several components that all blend in to here. Obviously with the trucks out of service and the stations down we do everything we can to save money and that is basically what has saved us money back in those budget years.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded all I am saying Chief is we are back to the question we had...you and I have had this discussion for the eight years that I have been here.

Chief Kane replied I absolutely agree with you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and I say to you again that I would rather see people washing the floors if it is going to reduce overtime. We had this discussion last year. So to put 10 people on to reduce the overtime, which is time and a half makes sense.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have had several discussions with the Chief about this budget and one of the things I think we agreed on was whether or not we could ever find a typical year at the Manchester Fire Department. I just wrote some basic notes and maybe that would be something that would be helpful Chief is not tonight but maybe just put together a little – the last 10 years of what went on because we had Engine #2 out of service for renovations and the companies were completely out of service so there were 20 people available. Some period of time preceding that we opened a fire station with 16 more firefighters on the job at a cost of \$1.2 million. Sometime before that Station #7 was under renovations and if I recall I don't believe we put the companies out of service, they were just relocated to other stations. At least the engine was. Maybe the ladder truck went out of service.

Chief Kane responded the ladder truck went out.

Alderman O'Neil stated so the unfortunate thing is there hasn't been a typical year at the Fire Department. In some years we have added and in some years we have taken away. That might be helpful in just laying this out. Following up on the Chairman's comments about putting more people on, I think it is worth doing. If I recall, we have a report that was done by the Internal Auditor, Kevin Buckley and I think his report was inconclusive if I recall. I could be wrong. He couldn't reach a determination one way or the other if I recall. I do think...Chief is this...you are in a fairly good position being almost the middle of May with a full complement going into the summer vacation time. That is not always the case. Am I correct on that?

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we have a little bit of that on our side. Absolute full complement. I think the Board had approved last year the over/under and for a period while you had these recruits...well what you had planned when they were coming out of school was that you were actually going to have one extra firefighter if I recall.

Chief Kane responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated and then you had a retirement so that kind of evened things out.

Chief Kane stated I have been trying to use this over/under policy that we have been allowed to do to push it up against the overtime and what that over/under is is basically I have a set manpower of 258 individuals and sometimes what I would do if I am going into a high overtime period I would hire additional staff over that number to balance that out and that kind of helps out there. We do really try to manage that overtime on a day-to-day basis.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a couple of other comments. I wish we would make a call on this ladder truck situation. It is not his responsibility or the department's responsibility, it is ours. This ladder truck situation, West Side, East Side, South End, North End has gone on since I have been around here. If we believe we can run the City with less ladder trucks then we should make that decision. It is not fair to the administration of the department and it is not fair to the rank and file to not be giving them the same tools throughout the year in my opinion. This isn't Springfield, MA. You can go on their website and they highlight four or five fire stations that may be out of service on any given day. Springfield, MA is in receivership. We don't have that problem here. Finally in defending the department I am very frustrated with the numbers. They are what they are and I think if the Chief or if I knew how to figure this out we probably would not be sitting here but doing something else making a whole lot of money. It is a complicated issue. Injuries on the job and off the job enter into this. I do share the frustration with the number and I do share the frustration with the possibility of closing ladder trucks and I hope we can work through this thing. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Alderman DeVries stated I will finish what I was trying to say before because what I am looking for from your department is that we won't see additional apparatus put out of service in order to fulfill the budget that you are agreeing to – the yellow sheet response that you are agreeing to tonight because an additional pump put out of service is equivalent to one and a half stations closed in the City.

Chief Kane responded I do not anticipate doing that. I can't say no for everything but from what I am seeing in front of me and where I am right now there is not reason for me to do that type of thing. The answer is no.

Alderman DeVries stated my second question is to respond to the Mayor's comments because we have every reason in the world to be concerned with the \$1 million salary adjustment. Between yourself, your office, the *Union Leader* and others, the City has been sold on an expectation of receiving tax cuts. For you to sit there and say that we can increase to that means that we are doing something

with this budget. That hasn't been decided by this Board. We have to operate under the assumption that your budget is going to be adopted. We have a \$1 million salary adjustment account in front of us. We have \$1.4 million or just over \$1 million that this department needs to prevent putting more than two ladder trucks out of service during the year. We have another \$250,000 that the Police Department needs. That means that Frank Thomas is not going to be a happy camper when he gets up here from the Highway Department nor any other department head that is listening or in the room because their needs are not going to be fulfilled because we will take care of Police and Fire. I do agree with you. There are going to be a lot more lay-offs in the City unless the public indicates that...

Mayor Guinta interjected that is not true.

Alderman DeVries stated that is my take on it your Honor. I don't see how \$1 million...cutting \$2.4 million, your own words, we cut \$2.4 million out of the salary line item across the City.

Mayor Guinta stated it is called management.

Alderman DeVries stated we have only put \$1 million aside for that.

Mayor Guinta responded I apologize for the interruption but I would like to respond. I presented a tax cut. I believe that this budget works. I believe that it is manageable. Do I believe it requires myself and the department heads to work a little harder? Absolutely. I am certainly committed to it and I can tell you the department heads are too. I read in the paper today that we might have a tax hike. So it is up to this Board where you are going to go from here but today I read that we are going to have anywhere between a 2% and 4% tax hike. If that is the decision that this Board wants to make I will tell you right now that I don't think it is reasonable, responsible or prudent but if that is the direction this Board wants to go in, so be it. I think that we need to start looking at how we budget differently. We have budgeted each and every year the same way and you know what it resulted in? Six years of tax hikes. So I am asking this Board and by and large this Board has been very responsive and receptive to looking at this process and try to make this new process, this new budgeting approach work. If this Board...again I will say it again. If you feel that there are concerns, make some tough decisions. If your priority...our priorities have to be I think and most people agree public safety first. That means this Board has to make the policy decisions in other areas that I am asking you to make. If you add back everything into the budget that I have tried to reform you are not going to have tax relief this year or next year or the year after. You are not going to allow any real management of the overall budget. This shouldn't be about personalities. It

should be about reforming the process and recognizing that we can improve how we deliver service. This year we are going to go into performance based budgeting and I think we are going to continue to move the City forward in how we deliver services. Just because we did it this way two years ago and five years ago and ten years ago doesn't mean that is the only way or the only option we have this year. I would like to see tax cuts. I think the people are asking for tax cuts and I think they are asking for service as well. I am trying to put a budget together in a management approach that provides both. I appreciate this Board's responsibility, having been a member of the Board for the last four years, and the concerns that you are conveying but at the same time we have to look at the management approach that I have presented and give it an opportunity to work. At the end of this process if you don't feel that it is in the best interest of the City to take that management position then that is what the will of the Board is going to be but I hope the will of the Board is going to be let's try to provide tax relief and try to figure out how to make this work.

Alderman DeVries replied just a very quick response because I know Alderman Roy is ready to jump in. I would feel more comfortable with this if we knew that we were really starting with true tax cuts because we know that when we get done adding the overlay requirement by state law and the Veteran's exemptions back in, as well as some of the federally mandated items and pension obligations we are not looking at a tax cut anyway and I think that is what is making this even hard for this Board to even look at, as you suggest, making adjustments to the salary adjustment account and change that number and deal with this budget.

Mayor Guinta responded I don't agree with your premise and I think probably next week's Finance Committee meeting will address that so I am happy to address those issues that you just brought up but I don't agree with your premise.

Alderman Roy stated I want to bring us back to a very specific and absolute item and Chief I am not going to apologize for my comments earlier. I know you have big shoulders and so do your staff so I know that you may or may not agree with my upsetness but we will go from there. Yes or no Chief. Your salary request, your regular salary request, is that a number that comes from HR to keep you at a full complement?

Chief Kane responded yes.

Alderman Roy asked the health number comes from HR as well correct.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Roy asked the FICA number comes from HR.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Roy stated those three numbers add up to \$1,176,486. Our salary adjustment is \$1 million. You are one department. The Mayor has said twice this evening that he is going to keep you at a full complement to avoid putting apparatus out of service. I appreciate those sentiments but my question is how do you pay \$1.76 million worth of salary and benefits to people to keep at a full complement with \$1 million spread out across the City and if someone can answer that they are a better business person than I am. My only complaint with you, Chief, and your staff this evening is I want you to kick in the door and say I will not put out apparatus. I will not jeopardize public safety. That is my only complaint with you. The numbers that have been adjusted in your budget are not numbers you provided and I appreciate you trying to go forward with managing your department but I have a problem when people say we are going to manage to a full complement and the numbers are not there and that is it. If the Mayor wants to respond...actually I will ask the question directly. How do we keep a full complement in our Fire Department, which is understaffed as is, with \$176,000 less than the full amount on the salary adjustment line?

Mayor Guinta responded we are at full complement.

Alderman Roy stated for what this Board and this City deems a full complement. We should have DC's on and we should have officers on ladder trucks.

Mayor Guinta asked do you want me to answer the question.

Alderman Roy replied go ahead.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated we are getting into a debate and this is about putting a budget together. I think we ought to end the debate and come up with a number. The votes are going to be the votes. I understand what your position is but you know what? I look around this Board and I think that there were two votes, maybe Alderman Smith and myself just a couple of years ago regarding putting out a ladder truck on Webster Street and I didn't hear all of this anguish and screaming about putting out ladder trucks. Am I right Chief? Up until February if memory serves me right.

Alderman Roy stated I would ask for a point of order.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I am asking the Chief a question.

Alderman Roy stated I am going to appeal to the Chair because if someone is given the floor and asks a question...this is a debate over the budget and when certain Aldermen want to talk to department heads a certain way and when certain people are asking questions they retain the floor. Other times people ask direct questions and they are shut down.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked who are you asking the question of.

Alderman Roy answered I am appealing to the Chair of the Board.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked who are you asking the question of.

Alderman Roy replied if you are going to allow the question I will ask the Mayor.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked Mayor do you want to answer the question.

Mayor Guinta answered no.

Alderman Roy stated so the answer is you are not answering how we spend \$1.76 million for a full complement with \$1 million.

Mayor Guinta replied first of all the question was directed to me and you didn't let me answer and now you are not letting the Chief answer.

Alderman Roy responded the Chairman didn't let you answer. I am waiting for an answer.

Mayor Guinta stated you are the one who interrupted me. If you want the question answered, let me answer the question. We have a full complement. That is all you let me get out. We have a full complement. It is impossible to keep a full complement 365 days a year. That is in part where you identify savings and that happens all throughout the City, the Fire Department included. It is humanly impossible to keep the full complement 365 days a year.

Alderman Roy asked can I interrupt you for a second and this is a debate and I am sorry we are having this debate but we are talking about the Fire Department. We are not talking about managing other departments and laying extra money in or whether some department has an 8% vacancy and the Chief only has one. I am asking where the difference is. If we are going to remain at a full complement we are still short.

Mayor Guinta answered if you think we are short, Alderman, then find money in the budget to add into the salary adjustment and let us manage the City. It is either

that or you can add in all of the reforms that we are trying to establish and have your 4% tax hike and then have business as usual. I am here to make change and provide a different alternative and a different approach. That is what I think people are asking for. Up until this evening I think this Board was working towards that. I don't know what happened between yesterday and today.

Alderman Roy replied I can appreciate what people are working towards and what we are trying to do but the simple fact remains that if you are saying in one sentence you want a full complement and not wanting to put our apparatus, we are \$176,000 short if we use the full salary adjustment line item and that is not my math or anyone's math that is sitting here. On the budget from the FY07 request provided by HR to the Mayor's budget to the yellow sheet response. It is four lines that have been adjusted if you include overtime. I am asking how we get there. We are telling the Chief manage your department but don't put out apparatus. Manage your department but don't change your complement and he can't do it. Physically no matter how good a Chief he is he cannot do it because the numbers do not add up. That is my question. How do we get there with the Fire Department?

Mayor Guinta responded I tried to answer that.

Alderman Osborne stated I think it all boils down to we have the money and I guess the Chief has the expertise. We can't micromanage everything. I think every department has their own problems. Every department has their own amounts of money that they need and we have department heads that run it. I think if we took each department, instead of trying to micromanage every dime here because it is a very hard thing to do in a short period of time and if we take each department and probably an easier way of doing it is one department can probably take a 2% cut while the other one can only take a 1% and the other one can take a 5% cut and so on. You have to manage it that way and let the department heads run and manage those dollars. If the department head can't manage those dollars then we don't need a department head I guess. That is all we can do. We can't do everything as Aldermen in the short period of time we have to look at these things. There are millions of figures here. It is almost impossible for the short term when they have been working on them for a full year. I think we should just do what we can as far as looking at it afterwards. They are bringing in their yellow sheets. We look at the yellow sheet and try to find some things that are wrong like Alderman Gatsas with the FICA or whatever it might be. Other than that, that is about all we can do. We have to rely on each department head to run their own department. Thank you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked when did you close the ladder truck down on Webster.

Chief Kane answered July 18, 2004. It was reopened on November 7, 2004.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked wasn't that a vote of the Board.

Chief Kane answered I don't believe that it was.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked that wasn't a vote of the Board.

Chief Kane answered no.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked and it wasn't extended until February.

Chief Kane answered the date that I have is November 7.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked and that was for how many months.

Chief Kane responded that would have been six months.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so there was no discussion about that was a tragedy or that it was appalling or anything else. Not by the full Board at least because I remember that happening. It was in front of us. I remember the discussion about it.

Chief Kane stated I am sure there was a discussion in regards to it but that decision was the department's decision.

Alderman Roy asked could I...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected I have the floor.

Alderman Roy stated I need to educate you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded no I don't need to be educated, Alderman.

Alderman Roy replied yes you do.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if you are looking to posture for political reasons that is fine. We don't need to ask you. Alderman Smith was in it with me. I remember.

Alderman Smith stated I think that we have a lot of departments here and we are getting into personalities. I respect the Chief's remarks. I don't know how he is

going to live with his budget though. If we can move on it would be better of for this Board and the other department heads who are waiting to make their presentation.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Police**.

John Jaskolka, Police Chief, stated what we did is we took the bottom line from the white sheet, the blank sheet of paper that you discussed and compared that first of all with our input coming out with the \$378,501 difference. To that we looked at the latest reductions in health and dental insurance where we came up with a balance as you can see of \$57,554 from our budget to the white sheet budget. From that we added the health for the six new officers, dental for six, retirement and the increase in City retirement, which brought us to a number of \$283,127. In looking at the line item, we took the \$33,300 for uniforms and we overestimated one of our service agreements by \$5,060. Taking those two numbers and adjusting those, we had a deficit balance of \$244,767. If that money, that \$244,767 remains in our salary line, which also includes the additional six officers and the availability of the salary adjustment account, then for all intents and purposes at this point we can live with that number providing that the two items out of contingency are approved – the bullet resistant vests and the equipment for the six officers.

Alderman O'Neil asked so Chief you are saying...I just want to make sure I understand this, that we will have not only an existing full complement of 209 but also add the six police officers and we need to take those two items on equipment and bullet resistant vests...some was addressing just the six and the other was to address the entire force so we could add the six officers for \$244,000. So you are short \$244,000?

Chief Jaskolka answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated when you were in a week or two ago you thought you were going to be close to having enough people to fill an expected seven vacancies plus the six new ones somewhere around thirteen.

Chief Jaskolka replied correct. We have four now and our expectation is three more retirements either by the end of this fiscal year or the very beginning of the next fiscal year. Right now I have 13 people in various stages of background investigations. Some have gone through the polygraph. I think there are four that have gone through the polygraph and are ready to go for medical and psychological, which are the last two phases.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you expect there has to be some management of attrition during the year.

Chief Jaskolka answered I would expect there is going to be attrition during the year. We are looking right now...we are almost positive we are going to be looking at four to five retirements next year.

Alderman O'Neil asked beyond the seven that we have talked about.

Chief Jaskolka answered these are next year's numbers.

Alderman O'Neil asked well where are the seven. I thought some of the seven were in next year's.

Chief Jaskolka answered no. We have four vacancies right now with three more expected by the end of this fiscal year.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the seven are all expected in this fiscal year.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes but some may go the first or second week of July.

Alderman O'Neil asked and you said there may be an additional four the next fiscal year.

Chief Jaskolka answered we are looking at four to five next year yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked so for this \$245,000, based on what we know today and your situation is not unlike Fire you think you can make everything work.

Chief Jaskolka answered yes. With the expected vacancies next year and the length of our hiring process yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't want to hold you to this but your expectation today would be most likely you would not have to come back for the salary adjustment account.

Chief Jaskolka replied this is providing that the money is in there for the salary adjustment. It probably wouldn't be the \$244,000 but...

Alderman O'Neil interjected my point is if we agree on this \$245,000, that that number may be available and everything plays out right you will not most likely have to come back for additional money.

Chief Jaskolka responded most likely.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know we could have something happen where you have to commit significant overtime and that but as you know it now \$245,000 works.

Chief Jaskolka replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked including the six new officers.

Chief Jaskolka answered correct.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to double-check a number here. In reference to your increase it is about \$700,000 from the Mayor's budget. Is that correct?

Chief Jaskolka responded yes it is just under \$700,000.

Alderman Lopez asked and the \$244,767 you anticipate getting that out of the salary adjustment correct. That is an obligation for your full complement?

Chief Jaskolka answered yes that is correct. If we remain at full complement for the year that is the money I would need.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question that has been bothering quite a few of us Chief and maybe you can help us. Last year we gave authority for you to hire a person, an enforcement officer, to put into the Traffic Division. Has that happened?

Chief Jaskolka responded as I explained last time, Alderman, yes it did happen. You approved the positions and I hired...there were three vacancies at the time and three more positions approved and there was a fourth position to go into enforcement. Those positions were hired. That group was tested in June. The background process started in July I believe. Each background for each candidate takes between 4-6 weeks. Sometimes we will get two to three weeks into a candidate's background and we dismiss that candidate so the process starts all over again. Each background investigator can only start a candidate approximately every two weeks. The first week weeks there is a lot of follow-up that has to be done with the candidates themselves and then they can branch out a little bit from there.

Alderman Lopez stated let's get to the bottom line here because we have a time limit. Are you planning on putting an officer there because there is money going into the CIP budget for extra enforcement?

Chief Jaskolka replied the problem as I explained last time is the officers that went to the academy, one didn't make it through the academy. What I would normally do and what I was getting at is the officers that were hired as part of that hiring process are not on the street yet. They are back from the 13-week academy and they finished their 10-week in-house training and they are in the middle of their 5-week FTO training program. They are scheduled to be on the street on their own on June 6.

Alderman Duval stated Chief Ward 4 residents are going to be calling for services, specifically relating to reduction of speed on our City streets and to address the issue of escalating noise conditions. I just need assurances from the Police Department that when I pick up a phone as Ward 4 Alderman, in particular over the summer months when noise escalates and speed of vehicles and increased traffic and so forth throughout the ward, that I will be given assurances that the department has enough manpower to respond to those requests because it is a huge issue for us up on the hill. Whether it is Page Street or Rhode Island Avenue or Maryland Avenue or Hanover Street or Bridge Street we have an unbelievably escalating problem with the speed of vehicles throughout Ward 4. I know that in particular the officers dedicated to the Traffic Department respond to these calls and run adequate surveillance and so forth. Perhaps in the past there has been a shortage of manpower. I just need to know that when I vote on the budget for the Police Department as one member of this Board that we have some reasonable assurance that areas like...and the conditions that exist throughout Ward 4 and I am sure other wards like my neighboring Ward 5 that we can get the patrol officers we need to begin to address these critical issues that to me represent quality of life here in our City.

Chief Jaskolka replied what I can tell you in regards to that is there are two full-time enforcement officers assigned to the Traffic Division who are given directed patrol on a daily basis. The shift captains or the shift commanders also give out directed patrols to their particular units when they are not tied up on other calls then they will have their directed patrol areas plus there is also overtime money available for special details to enforce traffic and noise.

Alderman Duval asked with regard to the six new positions and getting your complement up to where it should be, do you expect to dedicate additional resources to those specific needs that I addressed.

Chief Jaskolka answered one of the hires, whether it is the seven or the six, whichever one is will be dedicated or will be assigned...that particular officer won't be assigned to the Traffic Division but a more experienced officer once these people are on the street will go into Traffic as a third enforcement position.

Alderman Duval asked so the number that you have requested and the number in your live with budget for FY07 as far as you are concerned we should be able to meet the needs of residents with regards to those two issues because if not then I would like to hear tonight what that number would be so that we don't...so that we are not told there is a shortage and we just can't respond to those types of needs.

Chief Jaskolka responded as I stated there are people assigned specifically to enforcement and the cruiser routes also have their dedicated patrols that they are supposed to be taking care of if they are not answering other calls.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated last week there was a discussion in CIP about a \$40,000 grant that was supposed to be used for speed and noise. It was a total of 604 hours and I divided that 604 hours after deducting the \$1,800 from the \$40,000 and it came out to \$63/hour. I know that the gentleman who was in front of us was hoping that he was going to get paid \$63/hour.

Chief Jaskolka stated I would go out and do traffic enforcement for that too but I think the Deputy can explain that to you.

Gary Simmons, Deputy Police Chief, stated that was Sgt. Bartlett and what he apparently didn't know at the time was there was a balance remaining in the account of \$11,600. We did calculations based on the numbers of details that were out there during that time. The average rate was \$39.99/hour. Obviously some were a little more and some were a little less.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me just tell you that if I take that number and subtract the \$11,600 from the \$40,000 and divide it by the 604 hours I am at \$47/hour.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated I can tell you that...I believe Sgt. Bartlett gave you that 604 hours. The hours I am looking at here based on the actual hours worked since it started was I believe 668 hours.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded that is not the report that was shown to us.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated the report that was shown to you showed a different date. It showed from July 1, 2005 through April 11. I am looking at the financial report here and it went through April 19 and...it started in August actually. Why there is a discrepancy in his report I don't know. I am just looking at the financials on it and all of the details that worked based on that project.

Alderman DeVries stated I just wanted to make sure that the rest of the Board heard what I think I just heard from you Chief in reference to being able to place a new individual in the Traffic Department. You indicated that that individual likely will not be placed until the new group of six completes training. Can you guesstimate when that might be and that group of six would be on the line?

Chief Jaskolka responded not necessarily Alderman. In the current hiring process now I am still looking at a couple of certified people who would be on the street a lot quicker than the six to seven month training period for what I call a raw recruit that has absolutely no police experience and not certifications and so forth. As soon as I can replace a position in the patrol division, the enforcement position in Traffic will be filled.

Alderman DeVries asked can I follow-up on that because to me this is a very important issue. The rest of the Board is thinking that if you are about to put a new Traffic officer into that department they may not fund that special detail. Now I realize that one additional traffic officer only working one shift isn't going to have the flexibility of that special detail that we have set-up in CIP. Myself, I don't advocate for that but the rest of the Board is listening. We know that the summer is the worst time for us with speeding and motorcycle noise. Are we going to have an officer in place with the new budget July 1 when the last detail dollars are done for speeding and motorcycle noise, is that officer going to be there or do we still need to fund that special detail account in order to have any ability to get some control in our residential neighborhoods?

Chief Jaskolka answered I can tell you that won't happen even with a certified officer because our tentative hiring date right now is July 10, which may get pushed back another week or so and even with an experienced officer there is going to be a five to eight week training period with our department. So you are looking at September as the earliest that the enforcement slot would be filled.

Alderman DeVries stated I have two more questions. The utilization of the new officers – are you planning to do any adjustment on the routes maybe to give better coverage in other parts of the City?

Chief Jaskolka replied yes. As a matter of fact today I met with a lot of my staff including the three patrol shift commanders and we initiated or are beginning to initiate the preventative policing plan, which gives them more leeway and requires them to do more of a manpower allocation as to where the calls are happening and where the hot spots are in the City and they will now have more flexibility as opposed to putting X amount of cars in X amount of sectors to move that around if it is a more quiet sector they may move a car out of there into a busier sector. So in answer to your question, yes, the plan is...the preventative policing plan is to do

more manpower allocations and study more calls for service to see where the real hot spots are to put more patrol units in that area.

Alderman DeVries stated and a follow-up to that question because I had heard this explanation before but when you start the shift over putting your patrol cars into your hot spots in the City taking it possibly away from some of the more remote, quieter residential neighborhoods, wouldn't that make it even harder for some of those neighborhoods that today say they do not see a police car frequently. They may see one even less frequently because we have gone with and I forget what they call it in New York but the new plan...COMPSTAT.

Chief Jaskolka responded most likely they are not going to see more cruisers often but if we are pulling a patrol unit out of that area it is because that area is quiet.

Alderman DeVries asked and this is leading right back to the special detail for motorcycle noise and for speeding in the residential neighborhoods because that is why that account was set-up in CIP, to help the neighborhoods that still have the speeding issues and still have the motorcycle noise complaints but weren't the hot spots that had police officers there frequently by their mere presence slowing things down. I would just make sure that those who are in the room listening hear that there is still going to be a use for that very small amount of funding in that CIP account and hope that they will bear with me.

Alderman Duval asked Deputy Simmons could you just qualify something for me. I am on the CIP Committee and we will be entertaining those requests on Monday evening but the department is still advocating for the funding through CIP of that special position that Alderman DeVries is referring to correct?

Deputy Chief Simmons answered I would say yes and that is based on the fact that the additional officers aren't going to be ready for the summer time to take care of a lot of the noise problems that you are going to see. The money we have allocated now will get us through June and we still have a balance of \$11,000 but yes this summer most of the officers won't be hired and on the street to take care of those problems.

Chief Jaskolka stated another thing with that is it is a dedicated detail. That is their responsibility, either motor vehicle enforcement or noise enforcement. They are not answering calls or responding to other calls. It is a dedicated detail out there to do just that.

Alderman Smith stated you say you can live with the yellow sheet budget. This includes a complement of 209 and we are going up on July 1 to 215 and that would include the extra amount?

Chief Jaskolka responded yes.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed the **Highway/Facilities Division**.

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated our yellow sheet proposal notes that we can live with the Mayor's budget provided that our salary and benefits are funded for our full complement minus 3% in salaries, which we would manage minus our purchasing agent, which we assume would be reallocated to the Central Purchasing Department if that is approved. What this proposal will allow us to do is determine how we reduce the salary line item by that 3%. However, this also will allow us to be taken out of this hiring freeze so basically what I am saying is that we will cut our salary line item by 3% and we will manage how we accomplish this 3% either through keeping positions vacant, eliminating positions and whatnot and be removed from the hiring freeze. The reason why we proposed that is that again I think we have a concern that we are going to feel the brunt of vacancies because as mentioned Police and Fire are going to have the priority. We are obviously the next largest department by manpower and if it is the desire of the Board to reduce our line item by 3% we will live with it.

Mayor Guinta asked how would you do that.

Mr. Thomas answered the same way you are proposing Mayor. By keeping vacancies and potentially eliminating positions I would accomplish that 3% savings.

Mayor Guinta stated so I assume every department head after you is going to do the same thing so why would we do it for Highway but not for every other department.

Mr. Thomas responded the way I understood it the Aldermen asked for an alternative budget that we could live with and I feel that...and originally the Aldermen I believe were talking about an across the Board 3% cut. I can't take a 3% cut in my expense items and obviously benefits but I can take a 3% cut in salaries so what I am proposing is a 3% cut in salaries and let me administer it. Let me manage my budget in a similar fashion to what the Mayor is proposing. Allow me to determine what positions should be eliminated if positions are to be eliminated and allow me to determine what positions should be vacant if I so desire and if there are other ways I can come up with a savings in salaries I will certainly do it.

Alderman Thibault asked does that mean that the money we allocated to you for asphalt, would you have enough people to layout the amount of streets that we would like repaired because some of the streets are in pretty bad shape.

Mr. Thomas answered the concern again that I have is we provide a service at the Highway Department. The services we provide are paving streets, fixing sewers, repairing sewers, constructing sewers, collecting trash and whatnot. All of that is very labor intensive and again the Mayor's budget, as proposed, represents a cut in the salary line item of 7.4%. That is a sizable number. Now again we have had discussions with the Mayor and part of that would be potentially covered with the 4% that was taken out but again I am hearing as everyone else is hearing that this money that has been taken out, this \$1 million, has to go to cover a lot of potential shortfalls in salary line items. Again, I heard that Police and Fire are going to take priority so I am looking that I am going to be on the bottom of the totem pole and if that does happen I am not going to have enough people to provide the services that you expect me to provide.

Alderman Thibault stated that is exactly my question. Will you be able to repair manholes and will you be able to do all of this work with nobody there?

Mr. Thomas responded it will be difficult. That is why I came back with what I thought was a reasonable proposal, which is a cut of 3% of my salary with the proviso let me determine how I can manage that. I can potentially do that again by not filling positions and potentially by earmarking positions to be eliminated. Again, let me manage by salary line item.

Alderman Thibault stated I am just afraid that we are not going to get a lot of the work that we normally get done because you won't have the manpower. That is what I am looking at.

Alderman Duval stated along the lines of the questions I asked the Police Chief, in responding to needs of Ward 4 residents and we have had this discussion before...the frequency of streetsweeping for example. Certain areas of Ward 4 I think are not sufficiently cleaned. Certainly the areas around Central High School. People frequently call me and indicate a desire to see cleaner streets in front of their homes. Those areas are high traffic and they need attention. Certainly more than once every couple of months they need to be attended to. The budget you are advocating, will I be able to report back to Ward 4 residents with reasonable assurance that we can increase the frequency of streetsweeping in areas that are desperately needed where there has been tremendous neglect over a number of years?

Mr. Thomas answered definitely not. The budget that I am proposing I will do my best to maintain the level of streetsweeping services that we presently have throughout the City, which is overall three times a year but definitely not increase the level of service.

Alderman Duval stated in an article that appeared in yesterday's paper, Intown was celebrating their 10th year anniversary. The Mayor was there and he and I agree on one thing – that Manchester needs to do a better job in years to come of maintaining its beauty and operating a cleaner City. One of the first things they pointed to with the success of a program like the Walkable Neighborhoods they said starts with beautification of our City streets and the cleanliness of our neighborhoods. That is along the lines of what I am talking about. I don't know how we can accomplish that but I would hope that we can institute a plan or revision of what we do and start servicing the neighborhoods that are mostly neglected and I hope we can accomplish that again with a number that this Board will allot to your department. In follow up to that, the newly created position that this Board previously approved and is looking to fund in this year's budget – the Trash Enforcement Inspector, was that included or do you see that being included in your budget request?

Mr. Thomas replied that has not been identified in any of our budget requests.

Alderman Duval stated just to highlight that again, in Ward 4 in the month of March alone I had 40 violations that were issued to offenders of trash ordinances. Forty in the month of March. Nearly all 40 were to absentee landlords who not only don't live in Manchester but they don't even live in NH so we need some relief there and again I don't know how we are going to address that concern with this budget but I guess we will have to continue to work with that and come up with a plan that is going to be able to help the neighborhoods out.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to commend you Frank for coming in with a budget and managing your own budget because that is what we hire you to do number one. So the \$21,456,356 keeps all of your vacancies so you can manage and have...if you need to hire those people as laborers or truck drivers that is what you are talking about I believe. Do you want to clarify that?

Mr. Thomas responded that total or what is show on that yellow sheet as I mentioned would assume that I have the ability to fill my vacant positions and still cut 3% out of my salary and I would figure out how to come up with that 3% cut.

Alderman Lopez asked and by doing this you would need no money out of the salary adjustment account.

Mr. Thomas answered I would need no money out of salary adjustment. That is correct.

Alderman Smith stated getting back to what Alderman Duval was talking about and beautifying our City streets, I noticed the only resurfacing money you are going to get is through CIP. Is that correct? There is no money in your budget for resurfacing City streets is that correct?

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct. That is the \$550,000 that is generated through the surcharge on auto registrations.

Alderman Smith asked and what would that amount to in the 12 wards approximately money wise because I know we treat each ward the same.

Mr. Thomas answered about \$46,000 a ward.

Alderman Smith stated so Alderman Duval you are not going to go very far with \$40,000 and pave City streets but I would like to get back Frank to your point about managing your department. I know what you are talking about because if we have a hiring freeze the people you are losing are the laborers and truck drivers so when it comes winter time you are not going to have anybody to drive those trucks or man those salt machines. This is why he wants to manage his budget. I think if you are looking for efficiencies, this is one way to do it. I commend you for that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if this is appropriate Frank and you might have mentioned it earlier when I was out of the room but if Central Purchasing doesn't not move forward we would need to restore \$63,000 in your budget.

Mr. Thomas replied no. The actual number would be \$56,367 in salary and approximately \$8,900 in benefits to that bottom line number that is on that yellow sheet.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if we are going to have a separate discussion, Mr. Chairman, before the budget is approved on the whole purchasing program that has been laid out from Central Purchasing to Fleet Management to the purchasing cards and all of that but I am not opposed to taking a look at it. I just don't know that we are going to get there before the end of when this budget needs to be approved.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded I am ready to vote on a budget now.

Alderman Shea asked Frank what is the difference between what the Mayor suggested and what you are asking for tonight.

Mr. Thomas answered the Mayor's total cut in the salary line item was 7.4% or \$601,000. What we are proposing is to add back in if you have my yellow sheet the Recycling Coordinator's position with a salary of approximately \$63,000 and benefits of \$21,000 and to restore 2.9% of that additional cut or \$237,000 and the additional benefits that go along with it to arrive at that bottom line number of \$21,456,000. So the difference is that I am restoring a portion of that \$600,000 that the Mayor cut in salaries plus benefits that go along with that.

Alderman Shea stated I have a difference of \$434,348.

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct.

Alderman Lopez stated I want you to clear up something for me while you are here. By ordinance you are the Fleet Manager and the Purchasing Agent for the City is that correct?

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct but I don't spread that around too much.

Alderman DeVries stated under the proposal you have brought in tonight some of the projects that we are looking at in next year's CIP were actually funded by doing them in-house and we substantially cut the cost of doing those projects by keeping them in-house. Will you still be able to fulfill those CIP projects in-house?

Mr. Thomas responded under my proposal and that yellow sheet and the ability of not being burdened by a freeze and hiring of filling my positions yes I feel that I can address the projects that have been approved in CIP.

Alderman Shea stated Frank if the Board does not go along with the additional money then obviously the impact will be very significant.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct. Again, looking at the worse case scenario that I won't have any salary adjustment money available to me because of the demands placed on the first two responders in the City, we are the third, we could have potentially an impact of somewhere between 16 to 25 positions that wind up being vacant in order to make up that shortfall in salary.

Alderman Shea asked how many.

Mr. Thomas answered 16 to 25 vacant positions in order to make-up that total shortfall.

Alderman Shea asked and where would most of those positions be.

Mr. Thomas answered if it was based on the solid freeze, the majority of the positions will be in the lower rated areas because that is where we get the greatest turnover. The truck drivers, the laborers, the refuse collectors, etc.

Alderman Shea asked so you would make provisions so that in the event that there is such a situation there would be no disruption to residents in terms of...I mean today...

Mr. Thomas answered correct. We always prioritize our services. Refuse collection is a priority that we have to address and obviously snow removal in the winter but what will happen with a great loss of employees will be delays of two or three days in collecting refuse in the winter time when there is a snowstorm because our people would be out manning the plows and the heavy equipment and there will be a delay in snow removal operations.

Alderman Shea stated I don't know if this is an appropriate time but you are in a sense although it hasn't been probably decided that there might be an additional type of responsibility on your part if the Traffic Department is absorbed someplace in the Highway situation. Does that impact financially your situation or does it have no kind of a bearing on it at all?

Mr. Thomas responded well the way I understand the proposal that has been presented, the Traffic operation minus parking would become a division. The division would be headed up by the present Deputy Director and they would have their own separate operating budget. In that case there would be very little impact to our operation other than we would be providing some administrative services for that division like payroll and bill processing.

Alderman Shea stated so assuming that there isn't money for the Traffic Department absorption in your department that money would have to come out of an appropriation that presently should be in the Mayor's budget regarding the Traffic Department minus the enterprise situation.

Mr. Thomas responded there should be a budget for the Traffic operation – line painting and the signals, etc.

Alderman Osborne stated I just want to reiterate a little bit of what I said before to one of the departments, I guess it was the Fire Department. You have to let a

department head do his own thing. You give him a certain percentage and see what he can work with. He has the expertise of doing this. I can see in this situation here where it can be done. We cannot cut a budget and not cut positions. I don't know how you can do it. Everything like gas, electricity, etc. is going up and we are going to be cutting back and I don't know how we can do it. I have been in business for 40 years and I can't do it in my business. Anyway, it is a job well done and I have to commend Mr. Thomas for what he has done.

Alderman Duval stated specifically referring to the area around Central High School I had recently requested that trash receptacles be placed in particular on Ash Street to the north and south of Central and perhaps even on Lowell Street alongside the school building. You know that the problem exists there with trash being strewn about and the neighbors are fed up and one of the ideas we had was placing trash receptacles. In this budget do we have enough money to buy adequate trash receptacles for placement around Central High School and will we be able to service those with City vehicles to sufficiently remove the trash weekly?

Mr. Thomas responded to answer your question in the Mayor's budget he did allocate some monies in our equipment line item. We should be able to work with that line item to buy a few containers for the public right-of-ways. In addition, Mr. Clougherty just informed me that under the school project there are going to be containers or receptacles provided for the campus itself. So there is a potential over the next year that there will be containers on-site and in the right-of-way. Can we talk about Facilities?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied sure.

Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager, stated the yellow sheet that was forwarded to the Committee is basically the same sheet that we talked about a couple of weeks ago with the exception that we added the City Hall maintenance position into our salary line items and as we discussed at that time we did shift around some of the numbers within the various line items to accommodate the 3% and were able to meet that successfully. Our Accounting Specialist would be retained at Facilities and we would also be given the latitude to fill the HVAC Technician vacancy as well as any subsequent vacancies. We reduced our special projects line and our contract manpower to accommodate that 3% cut but it is a budget that we feel we can live with. Obviously our request was significantly more and we do feel that we should be increasing the quantity of maintenance that we are doing but we appreciate the task that we have been given and that is why we put together the numbers that you see.

Alderman O'Neil stated just to make sure I understand this, the difference between the Mayor's recommended and what you can make work on your yellow sheet is about \$38,000.

Mr. Clougherty replied that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated and basically all you are asking us is very similar to what Mr. Thomas said, let us manage the division. Where we need to fill a position let us fill that position and we will make the numbers work. Is that correct?

Mr. Clougherty responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there any opposition from you if the maintenance person that has been in the City Clerk's Office is transferred back to the City Clerk.

Mr. Clougherty answered no we would not have any opposition to that.

Alderman DeVries stated the discussion for the reduction in revenue with the school chargeback scenario, did you confirm that number with schools. I see it is predicated on the \$143 million.

Mr. Clougherty asked the \$5,905,000 number. Yes I did.

Alderman DeVries stated you above that have the projected revenue of \$5.856 million so which one are we building on.

Mr. Clougherty responded the \$5.856 million is what we calculated based on percentages. The \$5.905 million is what was calculated by the School District and allocated in their budget.

Alderman Roy stated Tim on the front of the page you have "reduces special projects \$432,000" but on the last line item special projects you only have a \$167,000 reduction.

Mr. Clougherty replied it reduces special projects by \$432,000 from our FY06 level.

Alderman Roy asked could you tell us what that includes for special projects.

Mr. Clougherty answered well at the time during FY06 we had worked with the School District and had proposed substantial increases to maintenance, which were not accommodated at the time. We subsequently reduced them. As you can

see in our FY07 request we reduced that down to \$472,000. We are anticipating a significant decrease there one way or the other.

Alderman Roy asked so no services will go lost with that reduction.

Mr. Clougherty answered there would be services that would go lost. Special projects are just as the line item says \$10,000 to \$15,000 projects that we take on during the course of the year. Potential emergencies that come up and things like that. Those monies would not be there but again we are tightening the belt as tight as we can and we hope that we don't have a significant amount of emergencies.

Alderman Lopez asked what is the bottom line here. That \$38,000 threw me off. The \$6,940,642 is that the bottom number.

Mr. Clougherty answered that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Parks, Recreation & Cemetery**.

Ron Ludwig, Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Director stated during the white sheet budget process I don't believe we left here with a number. Although we did jot a number down I don't think it was a substantial concrete number that we were left with as a white sheet budget number. We did prepare a yellow sheet probably a little bit different than some of the other but that is because our situation is just a little bit different. We are trying to demonstrate on your yellow sheet the difference between Gill Stadium being in the general fund and Gill Stadium not being in the general fund. I don't know if that is confusing to anyone on how we prepared those numbers. We would be happy to try to answer that. Additionally, I just want to speak briefly one more time to the importance of the Business Service Officer in our department. Although we are a \$6 million budget, which is not huge by any means, this is a vital part of our department in that we are trying to run six different businesses under one roof. We have probably 16 different organizations to track in terms of School District use, chargebacks, non-athletic related and athletic related. He monitors all of our contractual agreements with the restaurant, ski area concession and different concessionaires that we have to make sure they are done in a timely fashion. He oversees completely the office staff. He guides them and teaches them each and every day. So he is an extremely important part of our budget and I hope that we will be able to retain that position. It was put in for a reason only seven or eight years ago just because of the fact that we have such a complex budget for such a small budget. That is just a little bit about that. The next bullet is I did have a conversation with the Mayor about funding salt, which was a \$10,000 line item in our budget. It is not in there. We also had a little...we were trying to determine how we were using sand and mixing it. It is a small item and we had thrown sand under miscellaneous item and that

was deleted because it was a miscellaneous item. In terms of salt, it was several years ago that the Highway Department decided that it would be better if we created our own area to have salt stored and take salt from. Lines were backed up within their yard. We all needed it at the same time. We were depleting their pile faster than they wanted their pile being depleted so we actually constructed out of some wide cement blocks with a wooden roof our own salt area. It is to the rear of our garage. It is environmentally sensitive. We did a nice job on it. Our men work right out of there. Our mechanics who are on call at the garage during snow emergencies load the men with our backhoe when they come back to the garage so it works fairly well for us. We do buy under the same contract as the Highway Department does to attain efficiencies there. Obviously they are buying such large quantities and we are just invoiced by the Highway Department. Additionally, in terms of...I will speak just a little bit about revenues. We did show some moderate increases in revenues, very moderate. We looked to the north and we looked to the south in terms of our competitors at cemeteries. We were a little bit low. We adjusted a little bit there and in our opinion we could get another \$12,000 their in revenues without asking people to purchase more. The cemetery business is changing a little bit. There are definitely more cremations today than there are interments so we see a little downturn there. Cremations are up to probably 40% or 50% today so there is a little bit of shift in what is occurring and we are trying to work with that. Gill Stadium you can see there is a little confusion on our part. I am assuming there probably is on yours as well that if the School District chose not to use Gill Stadium, which would be extremely unfortunate and I am hoping that when this process is all said and done that won't happen, but anticipating the worst we wouldn't see \$150,000 worth of revenue coming either into the general fund or the Enterprise, wherever that ends up. So we just want to point that out to you. Additionally, at Gill we are seeing a slight upswing in some usage. We are trying to fit them in around high school usage, which typically takes priority in some of our own local youth organizations. We have had some interest and we are trying to work with different groups to encourage a little more generation of revenue there. We have had NH Food & Lodging come in and speak to us and although they couldn't do it this year they would like to very much be at Gill for a weekend next year. We are working with a marketing firm that is going to take a look at all of our areas from the golf course to the ski area to the ice arenas in terms of advertising and potentially again this is off to the side of the general fund because I am now into the Enterprise a little bit but potentially we are looking in Year 1 of maybe generating \$100,000 there. With some additional increases to some hockey youth organizations we could be looking at a couple of hundred thousand dollars in the Enterprise. Why do I mention that? Because our department is not just an Enterprise and a general fund. Our department is 40 bargaining unit positions, men that are working all together and they are interacting. They are not separated. So when I start losing people at the cemetery or in the park division or in the recreation division it will

then begin to have an overall impact on the Enterprise where we generate money as well because the seniority list in our department does not recognize general fund versus Enterprise fund employees. It will just be moving employees from the bottom and then I will have to reallocate where those employees go. This budget that we put together that we feel is responsible at \$3,551,734 without Gill does include funding the vacant positions that we have right now. I, too, can only echo and I wish I was smart enough to think of it although I thought of the downside of hiring freezes what Frank Thomas just came before you and said. That couldn't be more true. Our departments are seasonal departments. Although I need those people to plow there are times when I hold back on hiring someone either to cover a pay out that I need to cover for them or I know that in spring I am definitely going to need that person because we want to be ready for Memorial Day at the cemetery and we want to have ballfields ready. So it is really far better for us to be able to manage those kinds of things and we try to do that. I was in a panic about a week ago because while I totally understand the Mayor's position that we were going into a purchasing freeze I e-mailed him immediately to tell him that this is the way I have been managing the budget for 10 months so that I would have a few dollars left to buy fertilizer and to buy things that we need that I don't buy in January and stockpile in a garage. So it is eminent that we are given some control over how we manage. I think that is extremely important. I am not opting away from the way the Mayor is suggesting to do it but if there was a mechanism that was put in place to not only appeal to the Mayor but appeal to someone else in terms of whether we would have a position frozen or not...it is a thing that we know. Public safety has to come first but when you are so far down the ladder on the food chain you start to wonder sometimes. I just throw that out there.

Alderman Lopez stated in reference to your revenue, \$642,755, adding another \$12,000 you indicated from the cemetery and \$160,000 that you are receiving from schools, that would bring your revenue up to \$814,755. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Ludwig responded yes.

Alderman Lopez stated so that is sort of a wash on the \$170,000 that we put in the general fund for Gill Stadium. I am going to put in my numbers \$814,755 as the revenue. In looking at the vacant positions, you have already filled the maintenance worker, which is nine months. Is the Recreational Worker filled already?

Mr. Ludwig replied what is a little confusing here and we have had some discussions with HR about this, we have...well not in Parks but in the Cemetery Division when we were consolidated with them several years ago they had three nine month positions on their books. Those three gentlemen work from April until

December and then basically they are laid off. They do receive some benefits but they don't receive vacation nor do they receive pay when they are laid off for those three months. Those three individuals are older individuals who have been in those positions for quite awhile. The Mayor did give us the good ahead to fill those three positions, which were showing up on Ms. Lamberton's vacancy report. So basically what we have vacant right now is a Carpenter position and a Recreation Maintenance Worker I position.

Alderman Lopez asked and those are in your budget right now.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes and those positions were vacant...the Carpenter from January. It was a person who was in and out with an unfortunate situation and the other position, the Recreation Maintenance Worker, Guy Lemay, just retired in February.

Alderman Lopez asked so the nine-month position that was filled is that calculated as nine months and not a year in your budget.

Mr. Ludwig answered nine months correct.

Alderman Lopez stated in looking at this and trying to get a lower number in your operating budget is there anyway that some of these items like staff development and so on down the line...I'll let you run your own department but any calculation there that we can lower that by \$75,000 or \$100,000.

Mr. Ludwig replied quite honestly, Alderman, we have looked at the...if you look across at the Mayor's recommended in some cases he has given us more and have recommended less. Again, that goes back to letting us try and manage on our own. I think in some cases the Mayor in the operating budget was more than generous. We had some discussions about the salary line item, which I think we have had some differences in. That's all.

Alderman Lopez asked if I give you a number of let's say \$3,600,888 or somewhere in the vicinity of 2% less is that possible. I am looking at the percentage along the same line as Frank Thomas and Alderman Gatsas who mentioned 3%.

Mr. Ludwig asked how did you get here. In other words you are taking 2% off of what?

Alderman Lopez answered your FY06 budget.

Mr. Ludwig asked you want to reduce...

Alderman Lopez interjected I want to reduce...your budget is \$3.71 million and I want to reduce that by \$100,000 and increase your revenue.

Mr. Ludwig asked so you want to take \$100,000 off of the \$3,721,734.

Alderman Lopez answered yes. Could you manage that?

Mr. Ludwig replied I can tell you that I can do the best I can. Again, I am going to have to play the attrition game and that is fine. We always do and everyone in this room knows that. It is tight. We could try. That is going to be close.

Alderman Lopez asked what about \$50,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it is an auction. Do I hear \$60,000?

Mr. Ludwig stated I am trying to do the math here. I worked these numbers several times today. We would be very close.

Alderman Lopez asked could you come back and give me an answer on that please.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes. It would be very close.

Alderman Shea stated in that scenario would your Business Service Officer be included in your complement. I really think that the way you explained it I don't know how you are going to manage your department without somebody being able to handle the financial aspect. You can't throw darts at the wall and say that things are going to come out the way they should come out. Obviously you have indicated that there are so many different components to your department that you would be running around like a one arm paper hanger trying to figure out exactly what is going to happen to your department. So to me one of the integral parts of your department is your financial officer. Regardless of how much you are given, this man is very important in your department. I don't know how you can exist in a sense without him. That is what you should make sure is included no matter what appropriation you are given.

Mr. Ludwig replied our number does include funding his position.

Alderman Osborne stated Alderman Shea went where I was going but anyway on your accountant or your business service officer or whatever name you have what is the cost of this position including benefits.

Mr. Ludwig replied \$98,852. Half of that would be in the Enterprise and half of that would be in the general fund.

Alderman Osborne asked and without this position how much would you lose. How much do you figure this position gives you or adds to your complement?

Mr. Ludwig answered it is difficult to put a number to. I am sure based on some of the things that he oversees in terms of restaurant contractual agreements and things of that such we probably save hundreds of thousands of dollars a year just having him in that position that we would probably lose. Well we would have to have someone else track that. There is no one else in our department that does what he does. There is no one.

Alderman DeVries stated Ron you will go back to the weakness of that particular lease agreement that I didn't like back when we entered into the arrangement with Derryfield Restaurant. In fact your Business Service Officer has to be maintaining an audit and we wrote that in that he can go in and audit their books any day because of the dollars that they will be paying the City for the lease agreement are predicated on their proceeds and unless we have somebody up there that is scrutinizing those books carefully it would be very easy for us to lose...I think you just said \$100,000, which would be a wash for the position but it could be more than that. That was a weakness built into that particular lease. I understand that we have an internal auditor in the City but he cannot maintain that on a daily basis – the oversight that is required and I just wanted to make sure that the new members of our Board realize that. We can go in and pull the books from that restaurant at any time to spot check to make sure that they are telling us their profits and sales are what they actually are.

Mr. Ludwig replied it is kind of ironic that you bring that up Alderman DeVries because just yesterday we received a check from the restaurant for the month. They have been opened since August so from August through December. We received a check, which Rick will be verifying with State Rooms & Meals tax and any way we can through the audit process of \$14,000, which is money over and above the gross receipts in our contract that we got so we are off to a great start there.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I guess we really don't need an audit because we probably have some honest tenants.

Alderman Thibault asked will this give you the young people that you normally hire in the summer to clean the parks and stuff. Will this still give you these young people to do some of that clean up stuff that you do every summer?

Mr. Ludwig answered yes it will and the reason it will is because some of the kids working in some of these areas are making \$6.13/hour. For us to get rid of those kids from 14 to 17...they do a phenomenal job and they turn into our laborers at age 18. We find out what kind of worker they are going to be. They are an integral part of what we do. They put out a lot of little fires that all Aldermen have in various wards and I have no intention of getting rid of those positions.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **MCTV**.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know and I throw this out tonight and I don't think we have to make a decision but in the first pass with both MCTV and the School District we talked about maybe making MCTV a CIP project to make sure that it is funded every year and achieves its goals and its mission. I know there has been some softening by someone on it but I am wondering if we still need to do that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked is that a question to me.

Alderman O'Neil answered to all of us.

Alderman Lopez I think Mr. Arnold was going to research that to see if we could do that.

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated if the question is could the Board in its discretion make MCTV a CIP project I think certainly we can. It becomes a question of the practical implications of where the money comes from and financing.

Alderman Lopez asked wouldn't it be better for it to be a CIP project because then the School Department would have to agree to it and if they didn't want to agree to it...if we put the money according to the Mayor who is going to fund it anyway but if we leave it as is they still send us the bills and the money is not released until they send us the bill. Is that correct Kevin?

Mr. Clougherty answered the reason it is structured that way is because the employees as I understand it are school employees and their benefits are associated with being school employees.

Alderman Lopez asked so by having it the same way we have been having it the School Department couldn't touch the money anyway unless they send you a bill for their salaries.

Mr. Clougherty answered right they wouldn't get the reimbursement.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked why don't we just give them a percentage of the contract and sign a long-term agreement.

Alderman Lopez stated I think they asked for a budget of \$396,753. I think your Honor you said you were going to honor that. Is that correct?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think we should put them in the same position that MCAM is. Why should they be any different?

Alderman Lopez replied fine if that is what you want to do.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that is not my motion. I am waiting for you to make it.

Alderman Lopez responded well you are the one who is bringing it up. I don't want to take it away from you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated you don't have to worry about it because you know how I feel about it. If you want to delve in there you should.

Alderman Lopez stated we are going to give them a budget from what I understand from the Mayor.

Mayor Guinta asked what.

Alderman Lopez answered you said you would give MCTV a budget. Is that correct?

Mayor Guinta stated I also said we needed to deliver tax cuts but you don't seem to be standing with me on that. If the will of the Board is to bring a tax hike in I am going to let you do your thing here. So you determine what you think they should get. I think they should be funded at their request but given the fact that I think we still need to provide tax relief, this Board has to make some tough decisions. I gave a recommendation. It seems like tonight you have added in...you are probably at a tax hike if you add in on the additions you have added in this evening.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we stay on the discussion of MCTV.

Mayor Guinta replied well he said he was going to stand with the Mayor on this so stand with the Mayor on tax relief, provide funding for MCTV at their request...

Alderman Lopez interjected I will stand on my own then your Honor. They have requested a budget of \$396,753 and I will put that in my budget.

Mayor Guinta stated and I think with a tax hike you are going to be standing on your own island.

Alderman Lopez responded probably. We'll see.

Alderman O'Neil asked where is MCTV currently in the budget.

Mayor Guinta answered it is in the School District budget.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we would have to take some action to move it...Kevin traditionally where does MCTV sit in our budget.

Mr. Clougherty answered traditionally it has its own line item in the City budget. This year it as part of the Mayor's resolution for schools.

Alderman O'Neil asked and then they chargeback based on that.

Mr. Clougherty answered right.

Alderman O'Neil stated so whether we follow tradition or put it in CIP we accomplish the same thing.

Alderman Thibault stated in the contract that we have with the cable company if we change this to the School District now the money that normally comes back to the City will it be going to School.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded only if we give it to them like we did with MCAM.

Alderman Thibault asked how is that going to work. If we give it to School, which is what the Mayor is advocating...

Mayor Guinta interjected let me just refresh everyone's memory. The resolution has it in schools. It became clear that schools wasn't going to make MCTV a priority so I issued a letter to this Board last week recommending that it be funded on the City side. That was before this spending spree that I have seen in the last three months. I still think you need to be funding MCTV. I still believe that the School District doesn't identify them as a priority so I think this Board needs to fund them on the City side. I would again ask the Board to look at what you have been doing and the discussions and deliberations you have been having over the

last two nights because you are at a tax hike if you move forward in the direction that you are moving forward generally speaking. That being said, I think you can provide tax relief and put MCTV on the City side.

Alderman Thibault asked where is the money that comes back from the cable company now. Where does it go now?

Mr. Clougherty answered it goes to the general fund through the Clerk's Office.

Alderman Thibault asked why don't we leave it as is.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess I would have to defer to or ask of Alderman O'Neil what exactly he is trying to accomplish because I understand the way that it is funded today might be to help accomplish some of the existing employees that are in the school retirement system and there are some pension issues and moving it to the CIP may only complicate that matter meaning that people would have to start over fresh as new employees on the City side. I am just trying to figure out what you are trying to accomplish other than stability of funding, which I think is something we would all like to see.

Alderman O'Neil replied what I was attempting to do when I asked that question previously was I had concerns if it was in the school budget that MCTV would not remain whole as is. The alternative at the time, I thought, might be that by making it a CIP project schools would have to use it for that intent. I am very comfortable, if the Mayor is comfortable, with keeping it as is. I think we accomplished that. The fact that it is not part of the school budget I am comfortable with. It has nothing to do with anything beyond that. It keeps MCTV whole and that is my interest.

Alderman DeVries stated I have a follow-up question that I don't think you need to answer just a clarification. When you say "as is" you are referring to the arrangement that we had in every prior budget year before the budget proposal came forward this year.

Alderman O'Neil responded same staff and same everything as we have been doing. That is as is.

Alderman DeVries asked so the same budget on the City side managed the same way.

Alderman O'Neil answered yes.

Alderman Roy asked Dr. Sullivan the \$15,000 decrease between the Mayor's budget and the can live with budget that you gave us this evening, the School District administrative finance charge, can you give a better definition of what that is and how long it has been in place.

Dr. Grace Sullivan, MCTV Director, stated the school district administrative finance charge is for when school administration charges us for running our books. It changes. Sometimes they say electricity. That is pretty much it.

Jason Cote, MCTV, stated that was a charge that was started in 2000 by a previous Finance Administration. In 2000 we got a percentage.

Dr. Sullivan stated it is a chargeback. Some grants get chargebacks and some grants don't get chargebacks. We do get chargebacks. It is basically \$20,000 and what we propose to do under this budget by only putting \$5,000 in the chargeback we looked at what we do at MCTV for the School District and we looked at the amount of meeting coverage that we did three years ago, which was about 25 meetings that we covered. Now we cover up to 84 meetings and then also special meetings. What we decided to do was to ask if we are funded at the \$396,000 level rather than the \$411,000 level what we propose to do is we would give the School District a Finance fee, which would be \$5,000 and the services that MCTV do like tape meetings, tape duplication cost of meetings and digital file preparation and programming of School District meetings...basically we will charge the School District for services like School District meetings and School administration projects and that approximate value is about \$15,000. This would not...we would not charge the School District for coverage of school and student events such as graduations, concerts, assemblies or the over 96 sporting events that we do or on location programs at the schools or our teacher training videos such as an instructional video for elementary reading nor will we charge the School District for MCTV equipment repair or MCTV equipment loan that we give to the high schools and middle schools and some of the elementary schools. So we were looking to where we could cut and where we could cut is the \$20,000 chargeback, reverse chargeback. So we are saying you are charging us \$20,000 but with just the School District meetings and School administration, not the schools and students, what we do for you is about...we took a good look at it and it is worth approximately \$15,000. That is for in kind services. That is how we got our number to \$396,753.

Alderman Roy asked has the School District agreed with this or not agreed or have they not seen it.

Dr. Sullivan answered I have spoken with the School District on many occasions about the chargeback and it is not something that we have reached an agreement

on but then again like I said three years ago we were doing 25 meetings and now we are up to at least 84 regular meetings and if we keep the chargeback with the \$396,753 we are going to have to go from our current staff of five to four, which means less coverage of events anyway. So we are kind of between a rock...well I don't know if we are between a rock and a hard place. I feel like we have been living in limbo for a long time. I think that it would be great to be funded at the \$411,000 and I appreciate the Mayor putting it back in and I appreciate the Aldermen for finding a way to fund MCTV and I appreciate all of the community support we have gotten. I do think that it would be a good thing once...and hopefully that we get funded but beyond this to look at exactly where MCTV should be, where our services should be and I think we need a little bit more time than just during the budget process.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked can you tell me...I looked at your budget for FY2005 and it was \$426,000. That is when you had MCAM.

Mr. Cote stated the Mayor's budget was \$458...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected let's try this again. Your budget in 2005 was \$426,000. That is when you had the employees with you from MCAM. If I understand the numbers, 20% of the \$1.1 million that we are getting that budget now has gone in a two-year period somewhere in excess of \$600,000.

Dr. Sullivan asked can you repeat the question.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas answered if I combine your budget with the allocation that we are giving MCAM that number has grown from a \$426,000 number to a two year allocation of somewhere over \$600,000.

Dr. Sullivan asked so there is no question. I'm sorry I thought there was a question.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas answered there was a question. I am trying to get some sort of assessment on how that has gone in that direction. If we are giving MCAM \$200,000+ and I understand we can't allocate where they are going but I think there would be a reduction on this side from a number because obviously you have less employees.

Dr. Sullivan stated at MCTV we have five employees. If you look at MCAM, they run one channel and have three employees. We run two channels and have five employees. In the past as I have said we have increased programming of meeting coverage and we have increased coverage in terms of not just instructional programming on the school side but also instructional programming

on the government side. We have increased programming expedientially on both channels. I don't want to get in to what MCAM does or doesn't do. I can't.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I am not looking to go to what they do and what they don't do. I am looking at dollars that were spent in a FY05 number, \$426,000, that provided the services on three channels. That is the only thing I can provide. I am saying that number now has grown to over \$600,000 in a two year period.

Mr. Cote responded with MCAM I think and we are not here to speak about MCAM but MCAM has multiple costs now. They have a facility and a different mission and I don't think I can answer that question for you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I don't think anybody that...well the people who voted for it I guess should be trying to answer the question on whether they thought this was going to go to \$600,000 with the MCAM allocation. I guess that is a general question...to the people who are going to be asking everybody questions I guess that is a question I am asking. Alderman Lopez did you think it was going to go to that number?

Alderman Lopez responded no I don't think it is going to go to that number and I think it is a fair question for MCTV and Dr. Sullivan to answer. Your question being why when MCAM moved...I think originally there was supposed to be two employees move over to MCAM is that correct Dr. Sullivan?

Dr. Sullivan replied originally that was an original proposal but a lot of the things that were talked about regarding MCAM I wasn't involved with that. I would say to that again we had sufficient money to cover from a grant to keep our fifth employee. MCAM has one channel and we have two channels. If you look at the amount of programming that MCAM is producing at the studio, they have a lot of staff. The programming that they generate is at the studio. We have to do a lot of staff generated...you know when people sit in front of a camera and talk and that is good. We do a lot of programming out in the community. We do a lot of staff generated programming for the community – community service so if we have five employees for two channels they have three employees for one channel. Also when we did public access...we don't want to get into that. I am not going to compare what they have done or not done. If you look at what MCAM will probably get this year under the projected revenue from the cable money they will get \$245,000. We are asking for \$396,000. So if you were going to do 1% for MCAM, one channel and 2% for us it would be \$490,000. We are not asking for \$490,000. We are asking for \$396,000 and I believe our product for the community, not just on meeting coverage but instructional programming, I believe that MCTV is a service that the community wants. That is for you folks to decide.

Alderman Lopez stated the \$374,000 is for the five employees so your line item is not very much money. It is all salaries.

Dr. Sullivan responded yes, salaries and benefits.

Alderman Lopez stated that is your budget okay. I guess I just want to try to understand that originally the reason your budget is the way it is is originally there were two employees going to MCAM but only one went. Is that correct?

Dr. Sullivan replied right.

Alderman Lopez stated that is the point I wanted to make. Thank you.

Alderman DeVries stated Dr. Sullivan you may or may not remember these figures but I recall when the public access component was part of the schools that there were a lot of issues not only with interfacing with the students but there also were issues with some lawsuits and some legal activities. Do you have any idea...I think that might have been part of the reason that schools had asked to have that taken out of the school building? Do you recall any of the cost of the legal fees and were those on the...

Dr. Sullivan interjected in 2003 there was about \$30,000 in legal fees. We won that lawsuit but it was an expensive lawsuit and it was good that the judge...the judge ruled in our favor.

Alderman DeVries stated I just wanted to remind the members of the Board that there were other reasons that the separation occurred and there were some issues with the legal matters going on in the School District and in the school buildings.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I don't want you to think that...I am just trying to make a reference of what this Board took for an action. It has nothing to do with you. This Board took an action less than a year ago to increase the cost of what you were doing from \$425,000 to somewhere around \$650,000. That is the action this Board took. It has nothing to do with you. You are looking for \$400,000. You used to do this job with all three channels at \$425,000.

Dr. Sullivan responded yes we did.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I am just saying that this Board took an action, whomever those Board members were who increased it by 60%. It has nothing to do with you. It wasn't an action that you took. It was an action that this Board

took from a financial position to increase the cost of something that was being done by 60%. That is my only reaction.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **MEDO**.

Paul Borek, Economic Development Director, stated this is my first appearance before the Committee and I wanted to pass out an addendum to the yellow sheet memo that I shared with the Committee last week to articulate some of the differences. What I had indicated in my yellow sheet response was that my office has found the Mayor's recommended budget acceptable and that budget calls for expenditures to provide for implementation of the Global Strategic Economic Development Plan that was submitted by AngelouEconomics, the consulting firm that we met with earlier in the year but I also wanted to elaborate on the fact that my discussions with the Mayor and also the discussions with the consultant indicated that there should and possibly could be potential to raise some private funds to match some of the City investment in economic development, marketing and recruiting services. So while the Mayor's budget calls for total expenditures of \$410,823 it also provides for revenues of \$264,282 including some revenues that have been generated previously like the repayment on the Wall Street Tower and the annual MDC contribution from funds earned by the Manchester Development Corporation but it also calls for \$143,000 in potential revenue to be raised from private sponsorships, memberships, and partnerships in conjunction with an overall ongoing economic development program. Given that that recommendation has just come forward and is being considered by the MDC and a firm fundraising proposal or feasibility study has yet to be prepared, that revenue is somewhat speculative or still speculative although we feel that it is well worth investigating. Consequently though I did want to indicate that if that \$143,000 does not materialize or only materializes in part it was my understanding early on in discussions with the Mayor regarding the budget that I would live within a budget that was comparable to the 2005 budget, which is the budget listed on the right, roughly \$267,000. I guess I am asking again for favorable consideration of the Mayor's recommended budget of the \$410,000 with an earnest effort to go out and raise some fundraising to match our efforts but I would assure the Board that I would not expend or the final number on the page indicates the net operating contribution or the difference between revenues and expenses. I would not go beyond that net operating contribution. In other words, the new dollars wouldn't be spent unless they were raised. I am not sure if that is typical of what has gone on in the past but I know it is something that I put forward and the Mayor recommended.

Alderman O'Neil stated I appreciate your honesty and being up front about the fundraising issue. You need to be commended for that because it would lock us into a commitment if we didn't meet those obligations. As you heard earlier,

everybody is going to be looking for that same pot of money that is primarily going to be used for Fire and Police and maybe some of the other departments. I appreciate that very, very much. The budget on the right, that reflects how many positions?

Mr. Borek replied the budget on the right reflects roughly 2.5 positions. The Director, the Marketing & Retention Coordinator position that is currently open and a part-time Administrative Assistant. It does not include within this budget the CDBG funded position for the Development Coordinator, which is also open and being advertised and interviewed.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the CDBG funds are not reflected then.

Mr. Borek answered no. That is not part of the City's operating budget. That is part of the Community Development Block Grant budget within the CIP.

Alderman O'Neil asked you would charge for that correct.

Mr. Borek answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked where do you currently stand with the Marketing & Retention position.

Mr. Borek answered we have received great interest in the position and we have narrowed the field down to three candidates that I propose to interview.

Alderman O'Neil asked this is the second round though correct.

Mr. Borek answered it is the first round for this position because Jane Hills recently retired. It is the second round for the Development Coordinator to answer that question and we do have some candidates selected there as well that we are narrowing down. It is the second round for that position. We received fewer applicants in December and weren't able to come to terms with a potential offer.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you going to hold making an offer until you know where the budget stands.

Mr. Borek answered if that is the wish of the Board I will do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated my concern and I am only taking this from various sources that I have read and some comments I heard on the street but the business community is not necessarily thrilled about this private fundraising effort. I have

had comments made to me that is what I pay taxes for. I think it is going to be more difficult than we think to raise that money.

Alderman Lopez stated along the same line, the \$170,000 versus the \$229,000 is that for three positions or four positions.

Alderman O'Neil responded that would be for four positions.

Alderman Lopez asked if the appropriation of \$410,000 was put into your budget and you hired these people and you did not make the \$143,000 you don't intend to release him because once we appropriate the \$410,000 you can spend that money.

Mr. Borek answered it would be my intention not to fill that position until I would receive positive indications regarding a potential fundraising program and not only for one year but a multi-year program, which is what the consultant recommended and what other communities do. They do a feasibility and they solicit commitments for multi-year. I guess I would go forward with the feasibility for the fundraising program but if the fundraising commitments were not made I would not fill the position.

Alderman Lopez stated along the same line MEDO has become a major priority in the City of Manchester. I think that is the reason we went along with some of the recommendations. In the appropriation of \$410,000 where you have showed that you can get the other revenue, which will probably be accepted by the Finance Officer as revenue coming in, it is just like any other department that says they are going to make X number of dollars in revenue and if they don't make it at the end of the year the Finance Officer balances the books for those who made more versus less. So I guess maybe Kevin you can help me along this line.

Mr. Clougherty responded that is right Alderman. An appropriation is what it is but if it were the intention of this Board to go along with what the Economic Development Director is saying we could go in the system and put in the lower amount until such money came back. He would have the capacity if the money came in to go up further on the expenditure side.

Alderman Lopez asked what would your professional opinion be since it is a high priority on the business community and the Aldermen who believe in it and the studies that have been done. If we appropriate the money with the intention of getting the revenue in, you might be waiting until next year's budget to find out if you can get that \$143,000 so how are you going to do your job? The whole intent was to build up the economic division in order to get more people in the City of Manchester. I would like you to comment on that.

Mr. Borek answered I do believe that investment in the positions could and would generate more investment in the City and more tax revenue ultimately, particularly with the kind of targeted industry information and advice that we have received from the consultant. I would say that perhaps we could look towards the generation of more property tax revenue through a recruitment of businesses and expansion of businesses by filling those positions. However, I also believe that we should try earnestly to work out and identify some partnerships that would be beneficial to the business community and to the City as a whole. While those comments that did come out regarding some concern about private investment, some comments indicated that perhaps companies, firms and entrepreneurs would be maybe reluctant to maybe invest in positions but they might invest in a marketing program or an initiative that would benefit their business and benefit the ability of realtors to generate more activity and banks to generate more revenue. Really that is the nature of the way economic development fundraising occurs elsewhere. It is really not...no one buys into funding positions but they buy into projected results and they also...when a feasibility study is conducted CEO's are interviewed and identify the kind of results they would like to see early on and they factor that into a work program that they believe in and then might be more positive about funding. You are right. That is a long-term effort.

Alderman Lopez stated just one final comment. I was with the Mayor over at the business community and I do support this because I think there is revenue and I think there are things that the Economic Division can do and I do support it. I think what is going to happen is if we don't move forward in an aggressive way to show the business community that we are serious about economic development and that we get the people that you need in order to bring in those extra dollars using all of the resources that you have it has been said many times that what we need is a good economic division in order to move forward. I am afraid that, and it remains to be seen, but I am afraid that you are going to be six months down the road saying well the business community hasn't given me \$143,000 and I can't hire a retention individual and I can't do this or that. There are going to be all kind of reasons why economic development is not happening. That is just a comment.

Mr. Borek responded if we do fill the Marketing & Retention Specialist and hire the Development Coordinator, as are presently in the budget, we will have three times as much manpower as I have now so I guarantee we will do more than I am able to do right now.

Alderman Lopez stated you are on an island of your own.

Alderman DeVries asked could you tell me when you expect the feasibility study to be completed or has it even been ordered yet.

Alderman Lopez answered the fundraising feasibility study has not been ordered.

Alderman DeVries asked but you have identified a consultant and you know that they are available in the near future.

Mr. Borek answered there are consultants who specialize in this and my goal is to bring it forward to this Board and perhaps the MDC Board since a private board is often champion of such a private fundraising endeavor. My goal would be to have the fundraising firms make presentations to the Boards to illustrate how this is done. There would be investment in that sort of feasibility study but it might yield results that we could use later.

Alderman DeVries asked is the expense for the consultant built into your budget.

Mr. Borek answered no it is not although it could be I guess but I didn't have a specific line item for the fundraising consultant.

Alderman DeVries asked so it is not in either of your proposals.

Mr. Borek answered right. I intended to perhaps have some discussions with MDC as to whether that would be something they would be interested in investing in.

Alderman DeVries asked so if that doesn't work out favorably for you how are we going to move forward or do we just stall. Do you have a contingency...I don't need to know tonight but I guess I would ask you to build a contingency plan on how you will go forward and I guess that will be coming back to us and asking if we can find any stray dollars.

Mr. Borek answered I can get some estimates and get that to you before you approve this budget so you know what that might cost.

Alderman DeVries responded I think that would be wise.

Alderman Long stated there were some of us Aldermen at a luncheon with Intown Manchester and an expert told us that to continue the attractiveness of the City the first priority is clean-up so we first need to continue to do that. To continue to keep our streets looking good and continue to keep downtown and the whole City in general looking good to be attractive. I think if we show that we are willing to commit I think businesses I have spoken with would be more apt to show their commitment. With that said, I don't know if Kevin might be able to answer this

but the \$267,000 could we vote on that and then if the \$143,000 comes in accept it as revenue?

Mr. Clougherty stated it really would have to operate the other way around. Otherwise you have to do a supplemental budget or take it out of contingency. A supplemental budget is pretty much the same process we have been going through here so I don't think you want to go there but what you could do is appropriate the \$410,000 and we would restrict the expenditure to the \$267,000 until there was evidence of the additional revenues and then to the extent that revenues come in you would be able to allow more of the \$410,000 to be spent or up to the \$410,000 to be spent.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked can you explain to me...I guess I am looking for a simple answer. We are going to spend \$143,000 and take in \$143,000? Is that correct?

Mr. Borek answered no I don't believe so. That is a good question. The fundraising consultants in this arena probably charge between \$25,000 to \$35,000 to do a feasibility study for a market our size. They would come up with a...they would interview businesses and come up with a strategy that might identify a four or five year fundraising program that could quite possibly be more than the \$143,000. The \$143,000 was a smaller number that I built in as kind of a transitional year that hopefully if we get a fundraising program underway we might raise up to that amount. With a community our size, the consultant felt that we might be able to raise up to matching the City contribution or more - \$260,000 or \$270,000. I felt that maybe with an earnest effort through part of the year we could begin to pull in \$143,000. That might be a good target.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so I look at the \$411,000 and the \$267,000 and the difference is the \$143,000 in expenditure. Then I look at \$264,282 for a revenue and \$121,188. That is a difference of \$143,000 in revenue. My question for you is do we spend \$143,000 to raise \$143,000? That is what these numbers tell me and in business you wouldn't do it.

Mr. Borek responded the proposal is to spend \$143,000 if we are able to raise it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated you wouldn't do that in business. You wouldn't spend \$143,000 to raise \$143,000.

Mr. Borek replied but the \$143,000 isn't an outlay that we would make to raise \$143,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I can give you \$70,000 right now. Do you want \$70,000? All you have to do is go and take the banner deal that Intown had that didn't get any revenue. That is a \$70,000 revenue just to sign contracts. A three-year contract would get you \$210,000 without doing anything. That is just thinking outside the box.

Alderman DeVries asked Mr. Borek the point of investing in economic development or your office and the point of why a private individual would want to help fund an initiative to the tune of \$143,000 would be because it would drive the economy of this City or bring some other business initiatives that would serve their purpose or serve our purpose through tax revenues. Could it be that the \$143,000...we will see an increase more than \$143,000 back it is just not going to show on your books in your department? It might show on the Tax Collector's books?

Mr. Borek answered absolutely and beyond the Tax Collector's books I think the business community would have to feel confident that it would result in more business for them – more business for a bank and more business for a developer or real estate firm.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **MTA**.

David Smith, MTA Executive Director, stated when last we met we indicated that the MTA Board had taken action to find a way to increase revenues to offset the difference between the original budget submitted and the Mayor's budget. That left a difference of approximately \$44,000 in local funds or about \$88,000 in spending. In working with the Board in the past week we feel that we can meet that difference. We did receive this week our final insurance rate for health insurance and it indicates about a \$20,000 savings for health insurance against the original projection. As well we also feel that we can reduce expenses somewhat in vehicle maintenance expenses next year with the receipt of new buses. That and with potentially some minor saving of service with the implementation of the COA we feel we can meet the Mayor's budget target. At the last meeting of the Finance Committee it was suggested that MTA spend from its reserves and an amount of \$250,000 was indicated as an appropriate amount. We don't feel that that is a prudent thing to do. Essentially we feel that what that would do is delay service reduction. That essentially is a decision to reduce the service level because it puts off for a short period of time a decision on incremental funding, which would occur in the subsequent year so the MTA's position is that that money should be held in reserves and should be used as it has been for meeting the financial requirements and meeting cash flow requirements with delays in federal funds and that we should not be put into a borrowing situation for a one year reduction in the contribution.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I have to admit you are the first department that has come in and disregarded what this Board has asked you to do. Any questions?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Welfare**.

Paul Martineau, Welfare Commissioner, stated I gave you gentlemen the yellow sheet and I have the solution. I went back and looked at how much I have been averaging on revenues the last three fiscal years and it has roughly been \$94,000. I put in the revenue account...I was conservative and put \$50,000 and in this one I increased it. I am already at \$71,000 so I feel that I will hit...I feel as though I will hit the \$75,000 mark this year and probably go over that. If you take \$95,000 and add it on or \$45,000 and add it on to the \$50,000 that gives me \$95,000 in revenue, which covers what I need as far as my budget.

Alderman Shea asked so your final figure is \$1,305,819 by adding \$19,672. Is that what you have?

Mr. Martineau answered the final that I need is \$1,330,819. What I told you initially is that by adding \$25,000 to the \$50,000 for revenues it would leave me the balance. I need \$44,672 to it would leave me a balance of \$19,672 and what I am saying is throw that into the revenue because I have been averaging \$94,000 the last three years so it will cover that.

Alderman Shea stated the Mayor has given you \$1,286,147. Your requested budget was \$1,330,819. You are adding \$19,000...

Mr. Martineau interjected no \$44,672 to his budget, however, I increased the revenues from \$50,000 to \$75,000. Now I am saying increase it another \$20,000 and it will cover that \$19,000 difference. I showed you the adjustments to the Mayor's budget line item by line item. I have also made some economies and I feel as though at the end of this year I will be able to return some money again.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so basically you are looking for your request.

Mr. Martineau answered that's right.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated which is a 5% increase over FY06.

Mr. Martineau responded I don't have a calculator in front of me.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied well this calculator doesn't lie. So that is a 5% increase over FY06.

Mr. Martineau stated okay but if you take my budget and subtract the \$95,000 it brings me back to your 3% cut.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are you saying you can live with a 3% cut.

Mr. Martineau answered no. I am saying it brings me back to that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated well you had that same revenue last year. I am just looking at expense to expense. You are requesting 5% more than you FY06 budget.

Mr. Martineau stated well if that is what it works out to but then again as I am increasing my revenue and what I am saying is this year at the end of the year I will be able to give you some money back like I have every other year.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I am not disputing that. I am just saying your expense line is 5% higher.

Mr. Martineau responded you know why. If you cut 4% and you turn around and have Yarger Decker where you have a 3% and a COLA it is going to add up.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Senior Services**.

Barbara Vigneault, Senior Services Director, stated I wanted to take a moment to say that it is Senior Center Week and a proclamation was done by Senator Gatsas on behalf of the State Senate to recognize senior centers in the State of NH so thank you. The yellow sheet that you have in front of you shows the fifth scenario of our budget request and the Mayor's recommended and the FY06 budget and then the FY06 budget with 3%. The yellow sheet response does not have the new position and that is the only difference in that scenario. We, however, can live with that budget but as I said with the growing number of seniors that we serve with the new Senior Center the position would definitely be needed. We have seen an increase of numbers so it is vital that we do have that position but we can live without that position if need be. We offer multiple programming and that is another reason why we would need that new position. Sometimes we have special needs requests and that does take a great deal of staff time. We have a staff person that put in 178 hours of counseling to help people access Part D programs to bring income into the pockets of seniors. These are the types of situations that come up that make staff demands very difficult to meet. So we will do the best we can with whatever decision the Board of Mayor and Aldermen makes on our appropriation.

Alderman Long asked the \$331,744 is full complement – is adding a position.

Ms. Vigneault answered that is without the new position. That is with our current full complement.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Office of Youth Services**.

Martin Boldin, OYS Director, stated good evening.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked which one are we working on.

Mr. Boldin answered the one that says May 5, 2006.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what is this one. This is May 2? Marty you change these pretty quick. You would revise them...if we had another meeting tomorrow you would probably revise it again.

Mr. Boldin answered I can say without a doubt that I believe this is the actual final...if this isn't right I can't tell you what else. We have gone over it and over it. I can tell you this. I do appreciate the difficult that you all have to go through with this. It is an incredibly cumbersome process.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied that is not going to save you a cut.

Mr. Boldin stated to just get to the bottom line and keep the Office of Youth Services whole, we need \$596,927. If we work with your number of \$557,234 we have to lay off staff to meet that number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what was that number again.

Mr. Boldin stated the last number that we walked away with was \$557,234. The actual 3% reduction from FY06 is \$537,094 and in either of those scenarios we have to lay somebody off. In one case sooner than the other but in order for the Office of Youth Services to remain whole we need \$596,927.

Alderman Smith asked how many employees do you have in Youth Services total.

Mr. Boldin answered we have 11. One part-time and ten full-time. We have one full-time volunteer, one part-time volunteer and two interns.

Alderman Smith asked how many are specialized.

Mr. Boldin answered every one of them. The amount of training...what we do at the Office of Youth Services is we basically provide services for young people in

the community who don't have another service option. We are the last door for many kids before they enter either the criminal justice system or the Department of Children, Youth and Families Fostercare system. It is our mission to try to keep as many of those kids out of those situations as possible. The numbers of young people coming into the Office of Youth Services over the last two years has increased by over 30% and what we have been trying to do is find creative ways of working with interns and volunteers to reduce those numbers. Of the 11 employees we have, 7 of their salaries are offset by grant funds, which is one of the things that made our original budget process a little bit more complex. So we have really done the best we can to minimize the cost of our services to the City and I believe, frankly, that our services are very vital at this time in this juncture of the City and the development of the City.

Alderman Smith stated I certainly agree with you. I was wondering how many do you see on an annual basis?

Mr. Boldin responded we just did some analysis on that. Between 1998 and 2004 we saw an average of 300 kids a year – new kids, unduplicated brand-new kids. It is important to know at that the Office of Youth Services once a child comes in to see us they are ours until they are 21. So when we see a child when they are 13 they might come back when they are 15 and 17 but we don't count those as unduplicated cases. So brand-new cases we averaged between 1998 and 2004 300 a year. Between 2004 and 2005 our numbers went up to about 550 a year.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked that is 550 a year seen by how many people.

Mr. Boldin answered our complement has changed over the last two years. Previously to two years ago we had seven people and we didn't have interns and volunteers per say.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's try the question again. How many people saw those 550 kids?

Mr. Boldin replied everyone in our staff except one does direct service. So last year 10 of 11 people saw those kids and those are brand-new clients, not clients that we have seen and who have come back to see us several times. When we look at the hours of service that we actually spend with kids, those numbers are also increasing. So we are still at a place at OYS where we are developing a system to be able to collect and analyze data about the numbers of kids that we are actually seeing every year that are brand-new cases.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so if I asked you to give me a list from each one of those 10 people, you would show me that each one of them saw 550 kids in a 12-month period.

Mr. Boldin answered that is not...it is even across all employees. I am a person that sees people at the Office of Youth Services but my other duties don't allow me to see as many kids as everyone else.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's try the question again. If I ask you for the 10 people that you told me were going to see those 550 kids, then you would give me a list that each one of them would see an average of about 55. Can you produce that list because I know I have been waiting for another list for some year and a half and I haven't seen it? If you could kindly...I don't want to see the kids names. I just want to see how many people they are seeing on a regular basis. You are telling me it is 550 people and if you do the math that means it is one person a week.

Alderman O'Neil asked you have to back off two of the positions don't you – the Customer Service Representative and the EAP Coordinator.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I asked him how many people see those 550 people.

Alderman O'Neil stated well it is really eight people I think.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated we can do eight. It doesn't matter.

Mr. Boldin stated we can produce for you the numbers of people seen by everyone in the office and we can give you a list of people seen by them but it is not one new person per staff person per week. It doesn't...because the number 550 represents brand-new unduplicated cases that come into the office every year. When we look at kids that we are seeing right now and cases that we opened in 2005 or 2004 or 2003 those kids are also coming in. The only number I am reporting right now is brand-new cases that we open every year.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how many cases do you have in the course of a year.

Mr. Boldin answered I don't have the ability to answer that question. We don't have the data capacity analysis at OYS to answer that question right now. We could start to research that and give you that number but I can't give you answer for that right now. What I can tell you is that when we look at the amount of time that we spend with kids eyeball to eyeball that we spend on average at the Office of Youth Services about 70% of our time working with kids eyeball to eyeball. It

is not just one kid a week. We spend approximately 7 out of 10 hours every week working with kids directly.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I didn't make a reference that you were only seeing one kid. I think I know some of the people that are there and they certainly are doing their job with at risk kids. My question is how many people do you see in the course of a year? If you can't tell me that, why?

Mr. Boldin replied OYS when I came on board never had an advanced system for analyzing client flow and the number of kids that come through. What we have is a book that we write it down in and what we are trying to do is turn that into a system...into a computer system that can answer those kinds of questions because again it is hundreds of contacts with kids over the course of every week. It is a huge number. We don't have the data system in place yet to be able to answer that question immediately.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked do you meet with your staff on a weekly basis.

Mr. Boldin answered yes.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked do you ask them if they see five kids or twenty kids.

Mr. Boldin answered I don't ask them that during staff meetings. We have a report that tells us approximately how many touches they have with kids during the week.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so you have that report.

Mr. Boldin answered yes but it is not broken down...it is not a report that breaks it down the way a data report would.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how many touches does each person have.

Mr. Boldin answered it varies from week to week. I can say that we spend about 7 out of every 10 hours or about 70% of a full work week working with kids directly.

Alderman Thibault asked do you ever keep records of the kids that you are dealing with on a daily or weekly basis, how many of them get into trouble after you have consulted with them and such. Do you keep a record of that?

Mr. Boldin answered one of the programs that we measure very carefully at the Office of Youth Services keeps a very close track of how many young people we

see in that program and how many of them we were able to divert from trouble and how many of them we are keeping out of jail. There is a level reporting in one of the programs at Office of Youth Services that we can do that with but we don't have that data for every program that we do at this point. We are moving toward that. In that specific program funded through a grant and through CIP match, we have seen a little bit over 100 kids in the last year and a half and we have only made two referrals to court from those 100 kids. That program has also resulted in a reduction of about 60% in the number of kids that are sent to court from the Office of Youth Services. We are doing a very good job of keeping kids out of court.

Alderman Shea asked can you give me a little bit of an example of how many agencies you interact with. I know that you have a representative from Mental Health here this evening but what other agencies do you interact with?

Mr. Boldin answered the Office of Youth Services touches virtually every child serving agency in the City. We have weekly meetings with the Police Department, mental health, Division of Children, Youth and Family, Division of Juvenile Justice services on high risk kids that we are trying desperately to keep out of the court system and find alternative services for. We work with youth serving organizations like the Salvation Army, YMCA, YWCA, and health serving agencies. We also...our staff is every active in the community in serving and helping and assisting other agencies in doing their mission.

Alderman Shea stated one of the agencies you didn't mention was schools.

Mr. Boldin replied I am sorry. They are part of our Friday meeting. We have a weekly meeting for the most at risk kids in the City and it is ourselves, the Police Department, the School District, Department of Juvenile Justice Services, Division of Children, Youth & Families and the Mental Health Center.

Alderman Shea stated one other point. I know that you could provide a list of individuals but I don't know if it is possible for you to provide a time. In other words, some clients or people that you interact with you may have to spend maybe an hour with and others you may have to spend maybe a week with them in terms of interacting with them and I think that is very significant because when you measure the amount of time that you spend with a particular person it is not so much predicated upon how many visitations you have with X number of people but time too has a way of making your work very complex and very difficult – not your work but other people who work in your agency. So to require you to provide a list of how many people you see you would almost have to say well Client A we spent just five hours with but Client B we spent three hundred hours

with. That is very significant when you are making reports because obviously it is time, effort and involvement.

Mr. Boldin responded that is an astute observation. Many of the young people that come to the Office of Youth Services are in significant crisis and when they enter into our services they require a tremendous amount of interaction. What we are noticing is that the age cohort of kids being seen at the Office of Youth Services is decreasing and the severity and complexity of the issues that we are addressing are increasing so it is hard for us to talk about a typical case of what we do and to really give a number that is going to draw the picture of the spectrum of services that we provide – anything from something as simple as a half an hour phone call with a parent to talk to them about what is happening with their kid to spending weeks at a time, several hours a day with one kid who is in significant trouble.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked have you found a new location with windows.

Mr. Boldin answered we would really appreciate some help with that from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated my question was have you found a location with windows because it is...if people think that cutting Police and Fire is deplorable I invite them to go down there and sit with at risk kids in a room that has boxes and is probably 10 x 10 with no windows. I would think that is a question that I brought before this Board. My understanding was that you were going to move to the PAL Center but I guess after some of the experts in the field looked at it they told you it wasn't a good idea. So I guess my next question is why haven't we moved the Office of Youth Services into one of those vacant rooms that is in the front where the Health Department is? I don't think kids at risk should be serviced in a square box with no windows.

Mr. Boldin asked may I respond to that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas answered you may but I don't think you should because you are going to open up the door for me and I am going to walk right in.

Mr. Boldin stated well I do believe that we have spent some time trying to figure out a better location for the Office of Youth Services. One of the things I hope this Board would keep in its mind as they are exploring that question is that our service needs to be where young people are in our community and we need to be accessible to young people and where they are in our community.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded you opened the door so here I come. There is space that is in the building that you are in that has adequate windows and

probably gets less than 1/10 of 1% of use. I would think that you would be coming here pleading your case for those kids but I haven't heard you and I don't now if any other Board members have heard you.

Mr. Boldin replied the Office of Youth Services submitted a report to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in July 2005. It was sent to CIP and at that time we requested this Board to take a look at it and support us in making a move to be where the kids are in our community.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked where is that.

Mr. Boldin answered in my opinion if we could work out a way to situate ourselves to work with the Police Athletic League I think that would be an excellent option for the Office of Youth Services.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I thought you had an expert that looked at that with you and he said it wasn't feasible.

Mr. Boldin asked are you referring to Joe Diament. He came through and my recollection of his report was not the same as yours. I would invite us to go back and revisit that issue with him.

Alderman Roy stated Marty you built in \$9,400 into your building rent. Would that make a move possible?

Mr. Boldin replied no. That money goes to the EAP Office. We essentially administer their budget. Frankly the EAP's space has to be separate from the Office of Youth Services in my opinion and I believe Tom Jordan would come in here and tell you the same thing. That space has to be separate from any City facility because if it was associated with a City facility it would probably reduce the likelihood that people would want to use it.

Alderman Roy asked so there is no money in this budget that you have presented for any type of move to anywhere in the City.

Mr. Boldin answered we are a bare bones budget. There is very little that we could take out of this budget that isn't going to actually effect operations or directly impact young people who are in crisis or coming to us for service.

Alderman Roy asked under the equipment line item, the FY06 number was \$4,660. The Mayor put in \$4,660 and it has been reduced to \$1,000. What was that?

Mr. Boldin answered unfortunately we discovered last time I came here that there was confusion in the negotiation process with the Mayor. That \$4,660 was money that the Office of Youth Services received through a grant and that we directed toward the purchase of computers outside of what Information Systems does. So we got money from a grant that we were able to use to buy laptop computers for a couple of our people who spend time in the field. That money was injected into our budget in FY06 as a one time situation and we don't need it in FY07.

Alderman Roy asked so you can do without that and the \$1,000 you put in your budget is fine.

Mr. Boldin answered yes. Our understanding is that the Mayor's budget of \$578,075...Finance came to us and told us that again if we don't lay anybody off at the end of the year we would be entitled to \$17,254 back. That puts us \$1,598 short of being able to remain whole. So what we are asking for is the \$596,927 to remain whole.

Alderman Roy asked looking at the difference between the Mayor's number and your to stay whole number it would affect the tax rate by one cent per \$1,000 of valuation. Do you know what it costs to put a child at YDC?

Mr. Boldin answered I can say this. In 2003 at the peak of sending children to court, the Office of Youth Services produced CHINS petitions on 49 children. My understanding, and I don't have data here to back this up, but my understanding is to walk through the door at district court costs taxpayers approximately \$5,000. Last year the Office of Youth Services sent 14 kids to court. That should be a gross savings of approximately \$150,000. We, meaning the very dedicated staff of the Office of Youth Services and the relationships that we have with all of the players that we have mentioned and others in the community, are able to do an extraordinarily effective job at deterring young people from entering into the criminal justice system. Frankly we are at a time in this City where we need to be looking at enhancing services like the services provided at the Office of Youth Services and providing them in an area that is going to maximize our capacity to do good. I understand like every other department head coming through the door that this City is in a very difficult situation right now financially but if I get hit by a truck the one thing I would like you to remember is this. We are not going to make the City a better place by not supporting the needs of young people and the Office of Youth Services is the central location in the City for the kids who are neediest in our community. I beseech you and everyone else in this community to understand that the service we provide is absolutely critical to the kids who need it the most.

Alderman Roy responded very well said and I for one would definitely be willing to spend that extra cent on intervention versus incarceration later.

Alderman O'Neil stated Marty I just want to go back to an earlier comment. You said the number you left here with last time was \$557,234.

Mr. Boldin responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked and the difference between that and your stay whole is \$39,000 correct.

Mr. Boldin answered \$39,693.

Alderman O'Neil stated but you said earlier you would have to let two people go.

Mr. Boldin replied I am sorry I misspoke. I don't think I said that. I said to get to \$557,000 we would have to make a lay off. It would be one person. It would not be two.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't want to ask you specifically what position but...

Mr. Boldin interjected I really prefer that we don't have that discussion until we absolutely...if that is your will to do that...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I am not saying that is my will. I thought you made a statement earlier about laying off two people and the numbers didn't add up. I am glad we clarified that.

Alderman Long asked the 550 new troubled hearts that you saw was when. 2005?

Mr. Boldin answered yes 2005.

Alderman Long asked and that was up from...what was it in 2004 and 2003.

Mr. Boldin answered 2004 was also approximately 550 and the average intake between 1998 and 2003 was 300 a year.

Alderman Long asked have you at any time had a problem with the current staff that you have now sitting with a youth to the best of your ability that you feel would be to the best of your ability or have you sometimes because of lack of resources or staff kind of expedited something for a Band-Aid or what have you.

Mr. Boldin answered we Band-Aid all the time. The tragedy and this isn't just for the Office of Youth Services, this is for any agency in the City that cares and knows about young people. The tragedy for us in this current economic environment is that many, many times you know exactly what to do with a young person but there is no money for the resource.

Alderman Long asked with respect to these troubled hearts coming back because 550 are new but you still have ongoing...what number would that be do you think. Let's say we had 550 in 2005. How many of those do you think would still be in the system in 2006?

Mr. Boldin answered I can speak to that anecdotally. I would assume that we serve approximately 2,000 kids every year. The reason I say that and I can say that anecdotally is because again we are working on developing a data system at the Office of Youth Services that would give a precise answer to that number.

Alderman Long asked so you wouldn't know out of 550 that you would expect maybe 200 are still hanging around. You wouldn't know a number right?

Mr. Boldin answered I don't have that precisely right now.

Alderman Long stated that's fine. Are there enough programs out there...like you said you are Band-Aiding but I would hope that they would be persuaded to go into some program, somehow some way?

Mr. Boldin responded our primary function at OYS is to see somebody and get them to the appropriate service but you also have to understand that the kids who come to us don't traditionally do well in school, they are not playing sports, a lot of times therapists from the Mental Health Center will send kids to us that aren't engaged in those interventions and we are really the last door before somebody enters the criminal justice system. Our thinking quite frankly is this. The longer we can delay somebody from entering the system, the shorter their stay will be. So our hope is to do whatever we can to keep the community safe and to keep the family safe and to keep the child safe and to try to find an alternative to entering incarcerated status. Again, the system that we have right now is extremely overburdened with many more complex cases than there have been in the past. So we are constantly struggling to provide resources for young people where resources don't exist.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I asked you the question of how many kids you serve and you couldn't give me answer. Alderman Long asked you the question and you said 2,000.

Mr. Boldin replied with you I am trying to be precise.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that's okay because as precise as you are at 2,000 with 10 people seeing those kids that comes down to 4 kids a week per person. Maybe that is why you didn't want to give me the number. You have 2,000 touches.

Mr. Boldin responded that is assuming that we see those kids once.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if you have having 2,000 touches...

Mr. Boldin interjected no I said 2,000 kids but we don't see a kid one time. There is a kid that I have worked with in the past couple of years that I spent 16 hours with for three weeks in a row. We have people...we have kids who are in jeopardy of being thrown out of school that our case workers work with and see in the schools two, three, four times a week, on the weekends and in the evening. It is not the number of kids and that is why I was hesitant to put that number out. The number of kids is one thing to take a look at but the more important number is how much time are we spending per kid. What I am saying to you from that number is that we can say we are spending a tremendous amount of time actually with kids.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I am not looking at time. I don't dispute the time because I know some of the people that are out there in the field and it is not like they are only going to give somebody five minutes. I understand that. I am just trying to do a basis...obviously I am looking at your general fund budget of \$400,000. If I do very simple math and have 10 people I have to believe that the average payroll for those 10 people is not \$40,000. There has to be some supplement to your budget on federal funds to get you there. What do you receive in federal funds?

Mr. Boldin responded federal funds, depending on how you define CDBG, all of our grant funds equal approximately \$152,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked that is total.

Mr. Boldin answered we received \$160,973 in grant funds. \$8,000 of that is county money, 6% incentive money, and that doesn't go to salary at all. So the money to offset salaries is \$152,973.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so if for some reason those grants don't come forward next year what do you do with those people.

Mr. Boldin answered we are in trouble.

Alderman Shea stated to change the subject briefly and this is for my own information but the percentage of young girls now getting involved with the criminal justice system has increased. Has that characterized the Manchester population? Do you see in your agency more young girls?

Mr. Boldin replied unfortunately in the first quarter of 2000...the first three months of 2006 we have seen an inordinate number of female runaways that have really spiked our statistics. Again, and I think Alderman Gatsas said it the right way I opened the door and he walked through it...I am reluctant to provide specific numbers here because we don't have the capacity at the Office of Youth Services to answer these questions in a quantified way.

Alderman Shea stated according to the Mayor's budget, his budget was set at \$578,075. You are asking for \$596,927. A difference of \$18,852.

Mr. Boldin replied of which \$17,254 Finance has assured us that if we lay no one off we can petition back to the City. My concern like everyone else's is if that money is not there there is no way in the remaining \$40,000 we have in administrative costs that we could really offset that.

Alderman Shea stated so what you are saying in essence is that you are going to work to offset that.

Mr. Boldin responded what I am saying is that for us to stay whole I would like somebody to look me in the eye and say that we can have \$596,927. If somebody can look at me and say that is our number we will make that work for a year.

Alderman Shea asked which is an increase of \$18,852 from what the Mayor said he would give you right.

Mr. Boldin answered that is correct but I want you to understand...

Alderman Shea interjected I am all set.

Alderman DeVries stated Marty the data system that you referenced that you are working towards, is that part of the WRAP Resiliency dollars that are getting you closer to that.

Mr. Boldin answered when we applied for that grant one of the things that we recognized at OYS was that Alderman Gatsas and everyone else was entitled to ask very specific questions about exactly what we do and how much we do. We

have been working with Information Systems for approximately the last nine months to put this system together. Again, it is a complex thing to collect data in a meaningful way where you can produce reports that actually give information that people can understand that reflect reality. I anticipate we are about another year away from being able to actually do that in a meaningful way.

Alderman DeVries stated my question was more though the funding to accomplish that. Is that built into the grant?

Mr. Boldin stated we are not paying for it per say. We are working with Information Systems on it. We are providing them with the data sets and the analysis and they are doing the actual software configuration. I was told the answer is no.

Alderman DeVries replied no it is not funded within the grant.

Mr. Boldin stated we are not getting grant monies to get that software written for us. Thank you Carol.

Alderman DeVries stated my concern is that that will be finished because I think it is a little more than just my own thought that that is going to be essential to you getting future grants in order to have that measurable outcome. Without the data collection you can't prove that and it is going to be a real hindrance for you as you go forward looking for additional grant dollars. That is why I thought you might have put it right into the WRAP Resiliency so that you knew you would come out with that at the end of the time.

Mr. Boldin stated like most social service agencies we built most of our grant dollars around providing direct service. Again administratively we are very, very lean so we didn't write the grant that way. We are very fortunate to have Information Systems working with us on it.

Alderman DeVries stated I know there are some issues with the staffing at Information Systems and they have one vacancy existing and there are some questions with where their staffing will end up after the budget. Have you had a recent conversation to make sure that that will...just as we try to get a true picture of where our pain is?

Mr. Boldin responded I don't have knowledge of the impact on that on our process at this time.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Marty this is about kids. If there is a child that is at risk in the evening or on the weekend can the counselor get into that building to meet with them?

Mr. Boldin responded technically yes we can get into the building to meet with kids. We have done it on the weekends and in the evenings but the reality is as you know and as many of you who visited us at the Office of Youth Services know and as the report that was submitted to CIP said, the space that we have is not adequate to do our mission.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how often have you had an at risk child on a weekend or an evening and been able to have a counselor get into that building other than you.

Mr. Boldin answered I don't have an answer for that. Not more than a dozen times.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I would assume what you are trying to tell me and I hope this isn't what you are telling me that at risk kids only have problems during the day.

Mr. Boldin responded that is not the case. We meet kids in the community on the weekends, in their homes...I don't think there is a person at the Office of Youth Services who has not worked non-traditional hours.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that is not what I said but if somebody is looking to get into that office to meet with a family and a child it is not available correct.

Mr. Boldin responded it is not conducive to that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so if it is all about kids and troubled kids then we have a problem and we haven't addressed it and I have been talking about it for two years.

Mr. Boldin replied you have.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated there is a beautiful space right there.

Mr. Boldin stated we do have a sub-committee on our Advisory Board that is addressing this issue.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied two years with troubled kids. Unacceptable.

Mr. Boldin responded I agree.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it is unacceptable to meet in an office with no windows. Unacceptable.

Alderman Lopez stated the obligation on the grants, how much does the City contribute, for FY07.

Mr. Boldin replied in FY07 the City contribution against the \$152,973 is \$75,473.

Alderman Lopez asked and in FY08.

Mr. Boldin answered that grant goes away in FY08.

Alderman Lopez asked so then everything you developed is gone.

Mr. Boldin answered we would hope to find an alternative to that conclusion.

Alderman Lopez stated I know you looked at the PAL building but I have to agree with Alderman Gatsas. He has been very strong on it. I don't know even if they put a window in over there. I don't know if it can be done. A skylight or something but something has to be done. I don't think the information ever gets back to us. We all know the problem. He has brought it up. He had a good point about the weekend. I think a plan...these sub-committees continue to meet and the results never get to the Aldermen for some reason. I just don't understand why some type of recommendation...if the problem has been going on for two years and we are still talking about it I just don't understand it.

Carol Johnson asked if I could just address that as a member of the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board recently had met for the first time actually the whole Board came together and we discussed a lot of different things.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked where did you meet.

Ms. Johnson stated we actually met in a Boardroom in the same building that they are in.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked is there a lot of space in that room.

Ms. Johnson answered there were some members of the Board that had not seen the office at that time and one of the suggestions we made was go and take a visit because you really need to see it. There is no way that you can say that it is adequate space. It is not adequate space for what they are trying to do and the

population that they are trying to serve. I don't know of anybody who has been into that space that would disagree with that statement. On the other hand I think that as an Advisory Board just having an organizational meeting it wasn't the day to say let's decide what to do. Marty said to the Board it is an issue for us. It has been brought out in a report. We had just reviewed the report at that point and we said we need to establish a committee that can work with Marty and go and try to work with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to find an adequate space for the department. There was a sub-committee formed at that point. We are talking about a Board that is in its infancy. I think we only had two meetings. The other meeting was the other day when the budget issues came up and that is why you see the support of the other members of the Advisory Board here. There was a concern to make sure that the department is at least adequately funded at this point in time to have staff available to these children that they are servicing and the families because it is not just about the kids, it is about the parents and trying to keep the families whole in many instances. So I think that as this Board goes forward...it is a very active Board I believe in terms of members of the community and people that are concerned in terms of social services for the most part. I am sort of like the token government person on it so I would have to say that you will find that these people will become active in that process and I am 100% behind what Alderman Gatsas has stated on this and I believe the Board is too. I don't know that the Health Department would be willing to give up the big conference room in the front of the building.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I have a bunch of cards here with all of the Aldermen's phone numbers on them and I would suggest that the activists take the cards and start calling because that is the way things happen around here. I would suggest that they stay where they are at and talk to the Health Department because...you might have been in the small room. Were you in the one that was furthest down the hall? There are two of them in there. There is probably 10,000 square feet of pretty elaborate conference rooms. So I look at that space and say for two years at risk kids were in a closet. That is awful. I have a passion for it. You know that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do. I need to first make a point. I don't know specifically all of the space there but we approved money at the Rines Center over the past few years to create the back-up emergency operations center. I don't know if that is affected by some of the space we are talking about. Secondly in Marty's defense he has pushed on this PAL building and there was supposed to be some funding on the City side to do a feasibility study. That funding has never come forward. So in his defense he has pushed to take a look at the next step. There was no commitment but there needed to be some steps taken to see if it physically could serve the Office of Youth Services and the funding never came forward to do the study. He has pushed on that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded I don't think we need to study because you and I could go down there right now and understand that there is a problem. We don't need to spend money on a study. There is a problem. There is a major problem.

Alderman O'Neil replied if I may it is not to study that there is a problem. I think everyone recognizes that. It was to study how to make Office of Youth Services fit in the PAL building.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated why don't we just ask them to take some of the space at the Rines Center and see if they can accommodate that. I know Marty. You don't want to be there.

Mr. Boldin responded with all due respect to your love and passion for young people in this City and that is evident in what you have done, the fact of the matter is that the Rines Center is not a place that is conducive for young people to be and to come in. It just is not. I don't care how you cut down those conference rooms and put them around. It is not a conducive area for young people to be. We need to be in the community where the kids are and that is not north of Bridge Street in Manchester in that location. We will do what you want to do and the Office of Youth Services will continue to live our mission no matter what but we should be in a different location.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked any other questions because we will have this discussion again next year and I won't be so kind.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Finance**.

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Director, stated what we did is we gave you the Mayor's recommended budget, which was \$1,485,850. At our last discussion there was some mention of trying to purchase some of the lock box equipment out of this year's budget – about \$60,000. If that could be done we would reduce the \$1,485,850 to \$1,425,850 and we will do the job at that number.

Alderman Shea stated we discussed earlier Parks & Recreation and their Business Services Officer. If responsibilities are shifted to the Finance Department do you people have right now within your group the capacity to handle different programs that they have being handled by their financial officer now?

Mr. Clougherty asked are you saying that if the BSO at Parks wasn't there could we...

Alderman Shea interjected yes if the financial officer right there and ones in other departments, are you set-up now that you could replace those people with the personnel that are in your office now.

Mr. Clougherty stated no. What we have repeatedly said is that we have 12 full-time people and 2 part-time people. That is not enough to do all of the financial activity out there for all of the departments. However, if you were to consolidate the operations you would not need all of the people in the other departments. You might need instead of ten BSO's you might need five.

Alderman Shea replied what do you mean by consolidate.

Mr. Clougherty stated if you wanted to take a look at the financial operations of the City and centralize them and have a Department of Administration and do more of the financial activity in one area, which is happening through technology gradually anyway. We are seeing that happen all around the country. If you were to move along those lines and give us...

Alderman Shea interjected what I am saying is if, in our budget, we do not fund the person working in the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department can your office handle those responsibilities. Yes or no?

Mr. Clougherty responded in part as long as there are other people at the office that they have that are doing accounting there as well.

Alderman Shea replied no if all of his responsibilities are shifted. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. Clougherty stated what we look at is what are his responsibilities now.

Alderman Shea responded in other words the person in charge of Parks said that if that person were not hired or his services terminated he wouldn't know what to do because that person handles six or eight or ten different types of accounts and so forth. As head of the Finance Department the burden would have to be shifted to someone with financial expertise. Would your department be able to handle that?

Mr. Clougherty replied sure.

Alderman Shea asked without adding personnel.

Mr. Clougherty answered right because there are other people besides the BSO at Parks that are doing bookkeeping and entries. What the BSO is doing is making judgement calls and often times calling our office for guidance on that anyway.

Alderman Shea asked so basically what you are saying is that you could assume the responsibility.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes. I am sorry that I didn't understand what your question was but yes we could do that.

Alderman Lopez stated the fourth yellow sheet is \$1.425 million. How much money is that for the two employees for the lock box?

Mr. Clougherty responded one of the positions was for \$35,568 and the second one was for \$38,353. That is about \$73,900 for the two positions and that is just for salaries.

Alderman Lopez asked so benefits are 33%.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes and you would add in the \$60,000 for the equipment so you are at about \$155,000.

Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Officer, stated no it is \$121,537 for salaries and benefits.

Alderman Lopez asked is the \$60,000 in there.

Mr. Sherman answered no the \$60,000 has already been removed.

Alderman Lopez asked so subtracting the \$121,537 from the \$1.425 million what number do you get.

Mr. Sherman stated \$1,304,313.

Alderman Lopez stated I am not interested in going into the lock box. I think it is a bad way to go from just listening to people about lock boxes and paying by check. I think Joan Porter came up with some different ideas today. I don't know why in the world we would get into the lock box and bring everything in here. Even if you send a letter down to Connecticut or Chicago you are going to get your money.

Mr. Clougherty replied as we said the reason we undertook this initiative was to try and save two positions. If you are not going to save those positions it is not worth doing it.

Alderman Lopez stated that is my opinion anyway.

Mr. Clougherty responded we don't disagree with you.

Mr. Sherman stated doing it in-house will cost more than doing it with a third party. What it was doing was saving two positions. On the revenue side we had take \$60,000 from the Enterprise fund.

Alderman O'Neil asked the two employees are coming from other departments correct. Can you just review that?

Mr. Sherman answered the Mayor had identified one position in City Clerk and one position at Building Maintenance.

Alderman O'Neil asked and they are both...to the best of your knowledge there are people in those positions today.

Mr. Sherman answered one is vacant and one is occupied.

Mr. Clougherty stated initially it will involve some training for them to do the lock box and that is going to be a concentration but once it is in and they have it mastered you can start taking other lock box applications that aren't being handled through lock box now and apply some of those. You can have them do some better reporting off of the lock box information and maybe get some more efficiencies in the system.

Mr. Sherman stated we are seeing that a lot of businesses are starting to do their own lock boxes. That is why the technology prices have come down and the equipment is available. If it wasn't being brought to a smaller house the equipment wouldn't be there.

Mr. Clougherty stated what is happening is the banks are getting out of the business because the volume isn't there. It is really a transitioning from the paper as you go more to electronic and chips. You are getting out of checks.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed **Traffic**.

Alderman Smith stated on your yellow sheet, Jim, you have a total of \$727,987 is that correct.

James Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, responded yes.

Alderman Smith asked and that takes care of everybody's salary.

Mr. Hoben answered yes that is for a total complement. Parking is excluded. That was taken out. This is for the 11 employees.

Alderman Smith asked that is all you have in the Traffic Department is 11 employees.

Mr. Hoben answered there were three removed that are going to the parking enterprise, the two meter technicians and Denise, the Administrative Services Manager.

Alderman Smith asked and all of the other ones that are staying there are going to have the same salary.

Mr. Hoben answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked how much did the Mayor set aside for Traffic. Do you have that figure?

Mr. Hoben answered it was \$414,385. It is on the first page.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think what he was looking for Jim was the bottom line, not the top one.

Mr. Hoben stated it was \$962,213.

Alderman Roy stated I guess this question is for HR. I am a little perplexed why Traffic would be at 44% benefit number.

Ms. Lamberton replied I believe that is a number that they came up with and they must have added things that we don't normally add into that. If you look at the sheet of paper that we gave them, they must have taken all of the other numbers like FICA and things we normally wouldn't throw in there.

Alderman Roy stated the difference between the Mayor's and Traffic's total budget is \$109,494. I would ask that Traffic work with HR to refine those benefit numbers and that may close the gap some and get back to us with the actual number.

Ms. Lamberton replied I think the second piece of paper that looks like this those are literal projections from our system for all of the employees' salaries. All of the things that deal with an employee's salary and that number comes to \$727,987.

Alderman Roy asked and that matches the 11 employees that are now there.

Mr. Hoben answered yes. That is the figure we used for the 44%.

Alderman Roy asked so if I took out the salary number of \$505,080 and added right to left I would come out with \$222,906. So that just brought me first circle to the question why.

Ms. Lamberton stated for whatever reason they chose to combine it. We haven't been doing that. When most of the departments do it we list each item individually.

Alderman Roy responded I have no problem with the way it is listed or if it is totaled or separate. I am just wondering why we are counting on most of the departments being at 33% and Traffic is now at 44%.

Ms. Lamberton replied again I don't know how they came up with that number. I can only tell you that they must have taken...we normally wouldn't consider FICA a benefit. A benefit would be your health insurance, disability insurance, dental insurance, life insurance and retirement but not FICA.

Alderman O'Neil stated Ginny I know it is getting late but you said earlier that this looked good because it was the actuals. I thought you said something to that effect.

Ms. Lamberton responded what I said is this sheet of paper is the literal projections.

Alderman O'Neil stated so that comes out to the \$222,906. I guess that is where Alderman Roy is trying to take this full circle. If that is the right number then they are indicating it is 44%.

Ms. Lamberton responded again I have not done the math. All I can tell you is that we would not consider FICA a benefit. I think what they have done is added in FICA. I do not have a calculator so I cannot answer that question.

Alderman Roy stated so what you are saying is if we remove FICA chances are we are at 33%.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no that is only 7.65%.

Ms. Lamberton stated again disability we provide for...you can debate that. We use different numbers. We use 33% for new employees. We use 36% for longer term employees because they can have the higher level of health insurance.

Alderman Roy replied that is what I was trying to get at. So if they are starting at 36% and adding in FICA that puts them in a 43.6%.

Ms. Lamberton responded right.

Alderman Roy stated so that at least adds everybody so we are on the same page.

Alderman DeVries stated I would note what we as a Committee still need to address or the Committee on...where is this, we still need to address the administrative support to the department as well as...what is the other piece that is missing. Oh, who they will be assigned to. Who is going to be working on next year's budget for them. Certainly the administrative support is a piece that needs to be addressed before we finalize the budgets.

Alderman Smith stated I guess we are creating a parking division and some of these employees were part of the Traffic Department. I would just like to go over the...it looks like four people are going to be involved in the parking division. There will be a Traffic Manager, a Parking Operations Coordinator, and two Parking Meter Technicians. I want to know if anybody knows if the rates are going to stay the same with these individuals because I don't know anything about the new parking scheme or whatever.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded it came out of Committee. I know as much as you do and you were on vacation and I was here. I can't give you that answer.

Alderman Lopez stated I can answer that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked can we have Human Resources answer it. I thought maybe she was the expert that we have around here.

Ms. Lamberton stated based on the organizational structure and the titles of the positions that the Committee approved, there was a Supervisor of the Parking Meter Technicians. You had two technicians at salary grade 12 and a labor grade 15 supervising those two people. So the supervisor position was eliminated. Rather than having that person be laid off, we will demote that person to a Parking Meter Technician based on the structure that was approved by the Board and it makes sense because otherwise you would have a labor grade 25 supervising a labor grade 16 who is supervising a labor grade 15 who is supervising a labor grade 12.

Alderman Smith stated it makes a lot of sense but I remember and I opposed this and I wasn't against parking so much but I said I would expect everybody to retain

their jobs at the same salary and that isn't true and somebody has done something in a week or two. That is all I can tell you.

Alderman O'Neil stated having chaired the Administration Committee, this is the first I am hearing about somebody getting downgraded. That was never...I never saw that in any presentation that was made. I don't believe that was part of any recommendation unless it was in there and I missed it but I don't think I did. This is the first I am hearing of that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked Alderman Lopez do you know about it.

Alderman Lopez answered no I didn't know that. It was never part of the discussion to downgrade the person going in. I think the structure that HR is talking about is the Parking Enterprise structure. The person going into that position was never told that he was going to lose \$8,000 or whatever the case may be. There was discussion about Denise going in at the same pay grade and then being reviewed after six months to a year for that particular position. I think what the HR Director is saying is that the job title is lower than the structure that he is in now but I don't think she is saying, unless I misinterpreted...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected Denise I haven't seen a budget that is coming out of your sub department. Is that around here somewhere?

Ms. Lamberton stated I can give you one for the salaries and benefits.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied I know but what does it do for the rest of the budget. Are you going to just operate on salaries and benefits?

Alderman Lopez asked do you mean a parking line item budget. It is in our book.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas answered not parking. She is not going to be parking is she?

Alderman Lopez replied yes.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated obviously as I said awhile ago the vote should have been taken on whether this reorganization was going to happen. Did it come before the full Board yet? We are sitting here doing something and I mentioned this three weeks ago that there should have been a vote at the full Board level to move this down here rather than just talking about this because if you don't have the votes to do this we are going to spend an awful lot of time on nothing.

Alderman O'Neil replied I thought the Committee on Administration reported out to the full Board, not the Finance Committee. I think it came to the full Board. We were sitting as the full Board. I am pretty sure of that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas responded I don't think there was a vote taken. I think it was recommended to this Committee.

Alderman Smith stated a vote was taken and I opposed it both times. Alderman Osborne and I were the only ones who opposed it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so it has been authorized and it is in place and we are going forward.

Alderman O'Neil answered yes.

Alderman Thibault asked so this guy is going to take an \$8,000 cut.

Alderman O'Neil answered that is new tonight. I had not...that was not part of any prior discussion.

Alderman Thibault asked how long has that employee been here.

Denise Boutillier, Administrative Services Manager, answered 12 years.

Alderman Thibault stated we should check that out.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee